

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 932

HE 004 802

AUTHOR Tallman, B. M.; Newton, R. D.
 TITLE A Student Flow Model for Projection of Enrollment in a Multi-Campus University.
 INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Office of Budget and Planning.
 PUB DATE 24 Jul 73
 NOTE 106p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58
 DESCRIPTORS Campuses; College Students; *Enrollment Projections; *Enrollment Trends; *Higher Education; *Models; Simulation; State Universities; *Student Enrollment

ABSTRACT

This report is concerned with the development of a model for projecting the enrollments of The Pennsylvania State University by simulating the flow of students through the campuses and colleges of which the institution is composed. Because it concerns a twenty-two campus system of a single university, it not only constitutes an institutional application but also represents a prototype of a state-system of higher education. Markovian in concept, the model is based upon the premise that at a point in time a given group of students, possessing a set of institutionally-assigned characteristics distinguishing them as unique from all others, has an associated set of probabilities, which describe their distribution at the next point in time among similar sets of unique categorizations. When suitably classified enrollments at one point in time are provided as input to such a model and multiplied by appropriate sets of probability distributions, the output constitutes a projection of enrollments at the next point in time. (Author)

ED 083932



THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

HE 004802

OFFICE
OF
BUDGET AND PLANNING
University Park, Pa. 16802

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 083932

A STUDENT FLOW MODEL
FOR PROJECTION OF ENROLLMENT
IN A MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITY

B. M. Tallman and R. D. Newton

July 24, 1973

Operations Research
Office of Budget and Planning
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
I: SUMMARY	I- 1
II: INTRODUCTION	II- 1
III: CONCEPTUALIZATION	III- 1
Markov Process	III- 1
Model Formulation	III- 2
Transition Matrix	III- 3
Projection Model	III- 9
Mathematical Relationship	III-11
IV: DEVELOPMENT	IV- 1
Criteria for Structure	IV- 1
Categorization of Students	IV- 3
Location	IV- 4
Academic Level	IV- 5
Fields of Specialization	IV- 5
Data Requirements	IV-13
Associate and Baccalaureate Transition Matrices	IV-14
Empirical Relationship for Adjunct Enrollment	IV-17
Regression Equations for Graduate Enrollment	IV-20
Organization Matrix	IV-20
V: PROJECTION MODEL	V- 1
Components	V- 1
Input	V- 2
Operation	V- 3
Output	V- 5
Detailed Output	V- 5
Summary Output	V- 6
Evaluation	V-12
VI: SYSTEM APPLICATION	VI- 1
Components	VI- 2
COEF-1 Module	VI- 2
ITER-1 Module	VI- 2
DISAG-1 Module	VI- 4
Cost of Operation	VI- 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>PAGE</u>
VII: FUTURE EFFORTS	VII- 1
Projection of Transition Rates	VII- 1
Inter-Campus Student Flow	VII- 1
Graduate and Adjunct Enrollment Methodology	VII- 1
Organization Matrix	VII- 2
REFERENCES	Ref- 1
APPENDIX A: COEF-1 Module	A- 1
APPENDIX B: ITER-1 Module	B- 1
APPENDIX C: DISAG-1 Module	C- 1

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>LIST OF TABLES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
III-1	Illustrative Example of Distribution of Enrollment in Origin State Among Terminal States	III- 8
III-2	Illustrative Example of Transition Rates Between Origin and Terminal States	III- 8
III-3	Illustrative Example of Projection Model	III-10
IV-1	Campuses	IV- 4
IV-2	Hierarchy of Academic Levels	IV- 5
IV-3	Hierarchy of Fields of Specialization	IV- 8
IV-4	Fields in SMART Record Used to Categorize Students at Each Fall Term	IV-18
V-1	Detail of Projected Fall Term 1975 Resident Education Enrollment - University Park Campus	V- 7
V-2	Summary of Projected Fall Term 1975 Resident Education Enrollment - The Pennsylvania State University	V-11
V-3	Comparison of Actual and Projected Fall Term 1972 Enrollment By Campus	V-14
V-4	Comparison of Actual and Projected Fall Term 1972 Enrollment By Administrative Division	V-15
V-5	Comparison of Actual and Projected Fall Term 1972 Enrollment By Degree-Level Within Administrative Division	V-17
VI-1	Operating Characteristics	VI- 5

<u>FIGURE</u>	<u>LIST OF FIGURES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
III-1	Illustrative Example of, the Flow of Students From One Origin State to All Possible Terminal States	III- 5
III-2	Illustrative Example of the Flow of Students From All Origin States to All Possible Terminal States	III- 7
IV-1	Interrelationships Among Transition Matrix Vectors	IV-16
V-1	Schematic Diagram of Steps in Enrollment Projection Process	V- 4
VI-1	Flow Diagram of Module Interrelationships	VI- 3
A-1	Macro Flow Chart for COEF-1 Module	A- 3
B-1	Macro Flow Chart for ITER-1 Module	B- 4
C-1	Macro Flow Chart for DISAG-1 Module	C- 4

I: SUMMARY

The patterns of movement of students in a multi-campus institution of higher education have a significant impact upon the magnitude and major program composition of the enrollment at any one location. Inasmuch as the size and make-up of the student body are determinants of the demand for instructional services, it is of major importance that the institution be able to measure and predict these patterns of flow and to reflect them in their projections of enrollment.

This report is concerned with the development of a model - designated as SFM-1 - for projecting the enrollments of The Pennsylvania State University by simulating the flow of students through the campuses and colleges of which the institution is composed. Conceptually, it is based upon the premise that at a point in time a given group of students, possessing a set of institutionally-assigned characteristics distinguishing them as unique from all others, has an associated set of probabilities, which describe their distribution at the next point in time among similar sets of unique categorizations. When suitably classified enrollments at one point in time are provided as input to such a model and multiplied by appropriate sets of probability distributions, the output constitutes a projection of enrollments at the next point in time.

Models of this type are categorized as Markovian in formulation. Although conceptually accepted by the higher educational community as an improved methodology for projecting enrollments, applications are few in number and even fewer in those cases involving not only movement within a given location but among

different locations as well. The model described in this report bears a resemblance to two previously formulated models of state-systems of higher education encompassing the aspect of inter-campus flow, but it differs from both in that it provides a much higher level of disaggregation making it suitable for both system-wide as well as campus management. Because it concerns a twenty-two campus system of a single university, it not only constitutes an institutional application but also represents a prototype of a state-system of higher education.

The work was conducted principally between December 1971 and August 1972. It has resulted in a system, utilizing the existing records of the University and the facilities of the Computation Center, which is capable, given a forecast of admissions, of generating a ten-year projection of Fall term enrollment by campus, degree-level, student-level, college, and department at a computational cost of \$35 with an annual updating expense of \$110. The projections one year into the future are accurate within 0.5% when measured on a system-wide basis and within 4% when the sum of differences without regard for sign between the actual and projected enrollments by campus are expressed as a percent of total enrollment.

In practice the Student Flow Model may serve several purposes. First, in conjunction with the Admissions Model it provides an efficient way to project future enrollments. Secondly, the output from the model when employed as input to the Instructional Activity Model generates projections of the demand for instructional activity. And lastly, the model may ultimately serve as an essential part of a total simulation model of the University.

II: INTRODUCTION

The ways in which students move through and from a system of higher education - progressing in academic level, changing their fields of specialization, transferring to new locations, withdrawing, and graduating - are major determinants of both the magnitude and composition of the demand imposed upon the institution for instructional services. Within a college or university, the demand for instructional services can be related to the enrollment of students at various academic levels in different curricula. Consequently, projections of enrollment similarly disaggregated are requisite for providing adequate lead time to assure the allocation of resources in an efficient and effective manner.

Although an institution - and indeed the educational community at large - may influence the patterns of student movement, it does not control them. Once admitted, the initiative passes to the student and it is the institution which must respond to the varying patterns of movement during the period of attendance. Consequently, it is of major importance that the institution be able to measure and predict these patterns well in advance of their occurrence and to reflect them in their projections of enrollment.

For this reason considerable interest in recent years has been shown in the use of what is characterized as the Markov process for describing the flow of students through an educational system. The Markov process is based upon the premise that at a point in time a given group of individuals possessing a set of characteristics categorizing them as unique

from all other groups - such as sophomore engineering students - has an associated set of transition probabilities, which in turn describes the status of the group at the next point in time - such as 80% will be junior engineering students, 5% will have transferred to another curriculum, 5% will have withdrawn, etc. Using historical data, it is possible to construct sets of transition probabilities, measuring the distribution of students in each origin state among all possible terminal states and to use these values as a vehicle for projecting enrollments from one point in time to the next.

Although conceptually accepted, there have been relatively few applications using a Markovian approach for projecting enrollments. With the exception of one by Gani (3) in 1963 concerning the projections of enrollment in the Australian system of higher education, all were reported around the turn between the last and current decades. Models for simulating aggregate enrollments at each major level of national systems of education were devised by Thonstad (15) and Zabrowski (16). Additionally, the technique was adopted to describe student-flows within the framework of resource simulation models for institutions of higher education by Koenig et al. (5) and Firmin (2) and to evaluate admission and enrollment options by Smith (12), Marshall (8), and Oliver et al. (10).

Of particular note, because they reflect the movement of students not only within an institution but also among different locations, are two other applications. The first is the HEEP model, designed and implemented by the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management (4) in the State of Washington to simulate the flows of undergraduate students by various academic levels within a state-wide system of higher education. The other, similar in concept but providing an additional dimension to the categorization of students, namely that of broadly defined disciplines of study, is a model

developed and pilot-tested by Baisuck et al. (1) of the Rensselaer Research Corporation for the New York State Education Department, but apparently not implemented for routine application by its sponsors.

Of more recent origin, NCHEMS, recognizing the inherent importance of enrollment projections upon resource management, initiated a program to develop an institutional student-flow model (7). Availability of this model is currently anticipated by the beginning of 1974.

At The Pennsylvania State University, a model was developed in 1968 by Newton (9) employing a Markovian concept of student-flow for projecting system-wide enrollments by academic level and college, but its utility was limited by inadequate specification of inter-campus flows. Later research conducted by Richard (11) provided evidence that different sources of incoming students need not be categorized separately for establishing their subsequent patterns of behavior. Both of these investigations provided insight for defining the design specifications of the model described in this report.

The model described in this report is concerned with projecting the enrollments in an institution of higher education by simulating the flow of students within and from the institution. Explicit in its use is the availability for input of a forecast of admissions into the institution. It is principally Markovian in concept, although it has been necessary to rely on other techniques at least on a transitory basis in order to circumvent certain informational limitations. As such it is not methodologically unique. What is unique about the model, which has been designated as SFM-1, is that it depicts student-flow within as well as among the twenty-two campuses of The Pennsylvania State University. Consequently, it bears a resemblance to both the HEEP and Rensselaer models, but differs from both in that it is more highly disaggregated, making it suitable for institutional as well as

campus management. Because it concerns a twenty-two campus system of a single university, it also represents a prototype application of a state-system of higher education.

Successful pursuit of efforts of this type are dependent upon the contributing roles played by a number of individuals and this project is not an exception. Several of these are of particular note. Even within an educational institution, acceptance of the need to break new ground can be a frustrating experience and for their support in nothing more tangible than a conceptualized goal we are indebted to both C. G. Norris and P. M. Etters. For their patient counsel and response to a myriad of questions in the process of design, recognition is due W. R. Haffner and A. W. Tyson. Lastly and of major significance is the contribution of C. A. Lindsay made years before work even began on the model; had he not taken the initiative in the middle 1960's in the development of what still must be regarded as a remarkable concept for maintenance of chronological records of student progression, the essential data for construction of the Student Flow Model would have been lacking.

III: CONCEPTUALIZATION

In the previous chapter, it was stated

that in a multi-campus institution of higher education, the patterns of student movement among academic levels, fields of specialization, and campuses have a significant impact upon the magnitude and major-program composition of the enrollment at any one location.

In this chapter it will be shown how these flows of students may be conceptualized in a form analogous to what is characterized as a Markov process, which in turn may be used as the basis for development of a model for projecting enrollments in an institution of higher education.

MARKOV PROCESS

A Markov process is a discrete time system characterized by a set of probabilities, one for each of the transitions from each origin state to each of the possible terminal states at the next juncture in time. Between two states, the transition probabilities or rates are assumed to be dependent only upon the origin state. If these rates, as measured from historical observations, are constant over time, they may be employed as the basis for projecting the flow from an origin state to each of the possible states at the next point in time.

The flow of students within and from an educational institution is analogous to a Markovian process. At any point in time, such as the start of a term, semester, or academic year, students may be categorized into states or common groups in accord with some measure of their academic level - first year,

second year, etc. and associate degree, baccalaureate degree, etc. - within their fields of specialization - liberal arts, law, engineering, etc. - within the institution. For a multi-campus institution, an additional element representing location is added to the dimensional characteristics of each category. For each group of students having a unique combination of these characteristics, there exists a set of probabilities which describe their distribution among all possible states at the next point in time. The utility of a Markov-type model for projecting student-flows lies in the fact that when enrollments, suitably categorized into common states at one point in time, are multiplied by the appropriate transition rates the result is a projection of the enrollments similarly categorized for the next point in time.

MODEL FORMULATION

In order to formulate a student-flow model in a form analogous to a Markov-type process, it is necessary to have available chronological records of students containing at calendar-identifiable points in time each student's academic level, field of study and, for a multi-campus institution, location. From such a record it is possible to determine

- 1: at some historical point in time, such as the start of the Fall term, the enrollment of students suitably categorized in accord with unique combinations of academic level, field of study, and location;
- 2: for the students categorized into each of these origin states, the enrollments at the next point in time, such as the following Fall term, in each suitably categorized terminal state; and
- 3: by dividing the enrollment in each terminal state by that appropriate to its origin state, to develop a set of transition rates.

The model operates on the assumption that the future enrollment is derived through the probabilities of students moving between two defined points in time from one state to other states. These probabilities are expressed by means of the transition rates. Once a student enters the system, there is a limited number of optional paths in which he can move from year to year. Once he is admitted to the institutional system, the individual either moves from state to state until he graduates or withdraws.

Transition Matrix

For illustrative purposes, a hypothetical example has been devised to show how data of the type described may be developed and used to compile the probability rates comprising a transition matrix. In order to simplify the discussion, the example is limited in scope to a single-campus institution. Let us assume that a hypothetical institution has students enrolled in two different fields of specialization - Letters and Applied Sciences - and at two student-levels - first and second year - within an associate degree-level program. Under such a structure, all returning and new students must be categorized within one of the following four origin states:

Letters - 1st year

Letters - 2nd year

Applied Sciences - 1st year

Applied Sciences - 2nd year

One year later, all of these students must be categorized within one of the following six terminal states:

Letters - 1st year

Letters - 2nd year

Applied Sciences - 1st year


Applied Sciences - 2nd year

Graduated

Withdrawn

Let us furthermore assume that, from an appropriate record source, we can determine that at a point in time, such as the Fall term of 1970, there were 100 students enrolled as first-year students in Letters. One year later, in the Fall of 1971, these same students were distributed as follows: 10 in first-year Letters, 60 in second-year Letters, 10 in first-year Applied Sciences, and 5 in second-year Applied Sciences. In addition, 15 had withdrawn from attendance in the institution. The flow of students between the one origin state and all possible terminal states during these two points in time may be symbolically described as shown in Figure III-1. In order to determine the transition rates between the origin and terminal states, the enrollment in each terminal state is divided by the enrollment in their common origin state. For the case under consideration, the computed rates between each pair of states is shown on the arrows depicting the flow of students in Figure III-1. As will be noted, these fractions account for the entire flow from the origin state to all possible terminal states between the two points in time. As a consequence, the summation of the rates from any one origin state must be equal to 1.0.

FIGURE III-1
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE OF THE FLOW OF STUDENTS
FROM ONE ORIGIN STATE TO ALL POSSIBLE TERMINAL STATES



In a similar manner, the various flows of students in the hypothetical institution between each of the origin states and each of the possible terminal states at their respective sequential points in time may be depicted as shown in Figure III-2. The distribution of the enrollment in each origin state among all possible terminal states for the illustrative example is shown in Table III-1 and the appropriately calculated transition rates are listed in Table III-2.

FIGURE III-2
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE OF THE FLOW OF STUDENTS FROM ALL ORIGIN
STATES TO ALL POSSIBLE TERMINAL STATES




TABLE 111-1
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE OF DISTRIBUTION OF ENROLLMENT IN ORIGIN STATE AMONG TERMINAL STATES

Origin		Enrollment At Terminal State				
State	Enrollment	Letters-1	Letters-2	App. Sci.-1	App. Sci.-2	Withdraw
Letters-1	100	10	60	10	5	15
Letters-2	55		3			5
App. Sci.-1	50	1	4	5	25	15
App. Sci.-2	35				5	5

TABLE 111-2
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE OF TRANSITION RATES BETWEEN ORIGIN AND TERMINAL STATES

Origin State	Transition Rates To				
	Letters-1	Letters-2	App. Sci.-1	App. Sci.-2	Withdraw
Letters-1	.100	.600	.100	.050	.150
Letters-2		.055			.090
App. Sci.-1	.020	.080	.100	.500	.300
App. Sci.-2				.143	.714

Projection Model

Provided that the rates comprising the transition matrix are stable over time, it may be employed together with the enrollment of returning students and a given forecast of new admissions at one point in time to generate projections of the enrollment of returning students at the next point in time. This is done by multiplying the sum of enrollment of returning students and of new admissions for each year by the appropriate rates in the transition matrix and then aggregating the products over common states to derive the enrollment of returning students for the following period of time. The process is then repeated in an iterative mode until projections are developed for the entire projected time-frame.

To illustrate in tabular form how the process proceeds in an iterative fashion, assume for the hypothetical institution an input of returning students for time-period 1 and forecasts of new admissions for time-periods 1, 2, and 3 and the applicability of the transition matrix shown in Table III-2. The steps involved in developing enrollment projections for three time-periods are depicted in Table III-3.

The number of possible student-flows has been limited in this example in order to illustrate diagrammatically as well as computationally the steps involved in the projection process. However, conceptually the steps described in the example are equally applicable to any student-flow problem regardless of the number of dimensions - academic levels, fields of specialization, and locations - used to describe origin and terminal states.

TABLE III-3
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE OF PROJECTION MODEL

(INPUT)		(TRANSITION MATRIX)				(OUTPUT)			
Enrollment at Time=1		Transition Rates				Enrollment at Time=2		Enrollment at Time=3	
New	Return	Letters-1	Letters-2	Ap.Sci.-1	Ap.Sci.-2	Grad.	Withdraw	New	Return
Letters-1	110 + 10 =	.100	.600	.100	.050	.150	.150	125 +	15 =
Letters-2	5 + 75 =			.055		.090	.090	5 +	89 =
Ap.Sci.-1	60 + 20 =	.020	.080	.100	.500	.300	.300	100 +	29 =
Ap.Sci.-2	2 + 58 =			.143	.714	.143	.143	10 +	68 =
Total								Total	
120 + 134 =								130 + 130 =	
80 + 88 =								94 + 94 =	
80 + 105 =								129 + 129 =	
60 + 64 =								78 + 78 =	
Enrollment at Time=2		Transition Rates				Enrollment at Time=3		Enrollment at Time=3	
New	Return	Letters-1	Letters-2	Ap.Sci.-1	Ap.Sci.-2	Grad.	Withdraw	Letters-1	Letters-2
Letters-1	120 + 14 =	.100	.600	.100	.050	.150	.150	13	81
Letters-2	10 + 78 =			.055		.090	.090	5	5
Ap.Sci.-1	80 + 25 =	.020	.080	.100	.500	.300	.300	11	11
Ap.Sci.-2	10 + 54 =			.143	.714	.143	.143	9	29
Total								68	121
134 + 130 =								121	121
88 + 88 =								68	121
105 + 105 =								68	121
64 + 64 =								68	121
Enrollment at Time=3		Transition Rates				Enrollment at Time=3		Enrollment at Time=3	
New	Return	Letters-1	Letters-2	Ap.Sci.-1	Ap.Sci.-2	Grad.	Withdraw	Letters-1	Letters-2
Letters-1	125 + 15 =	.100	.600	.100	.050	.150	.150	13	81
Letters-2	5 + 89 =			.055		.090	.090	5	5
Ap.Sci.-1	100 + 29 =	.020	.080	.100	.500	.300	.300	11	11
Ap.Sci.-2	10 + 68 =			.143	.714	.143	.143	9	29
Total								68	121
130 + 130 =								121	121
94 + 94 =								68	121
129 + 129 =								68	121
78 + 78 =								68	121

MATHEMATICAL RELATIONSHIP

Mathematically the enrollment at some point in time may be projected from a prior point in time by means of the following relationship:

$$E_{j,t+1} = \sum_{i=1}^m E_{j(i),t} + N_{j,t+1} \text{ for } j = 1, 2 \dots m \quad (1)$$

where: $E_{j,t+1}$ = student enrollment in year $t+1$ in terminal state j ,
 where j defines a unique set of characteristics common to all students in that terminal state.

$E_{j(i),t}$ = student enrollment in year t in origin state i who move to terminal state j in year $t+1$, where i and j define sets of characteristics common to all students in each of the respective states.

$N_{j,t+1}$ = new students entering the system in year $t+1$ in state j .

Since $E_{j(i)}$ represents measures of the flows between origin state i and terminal state j of students already in attendance, transition rates expressing the distribution of students in state i among state j may be computed from historical data as follows:

$$f_{ij} = \frac{E_{j(i),t}}{E_{i,t-1}} \text{ for } j = 1, 2 \dots m \quad (2)$$

where: f_{ij} = transition rate of students between origin state i and terminal state j .

Therefore, Equation 1 may be expressed as follows:

$$E_{j,t+1} = \sum_{i=1}^m f_{ij} E_{i,t} + N_{j,t+1} \text{ for } j = 1, 2 \dots m \quad (3)$$

IV: DEVELOPMENT

In the previous chapters, it was shown

- 1: *that in a multi-campus institution of higher education, the patterns of student movement among academic levels, fields of specialization, and campuses have a significant impact upon the magnitude and major-program composition of enrollment at any one location, and*
- 2: *that these patterns of movement may be described by sets of transition rates expressing the probabilities of students following various paths between successive points in time.*

This chapter is concerned with establishment of a suitable base of historical data from which the transition matrices as well as ancillary relationships may be developed for incorporation with a model for projecting student-flow for a large multi-campus institution, namely The Pennsylvania State University.

CRITERIA FOR STRUCTURE

Inasmuch as the composition of the output from a model is dependent upon both the structure of the model and the data used to develop it, a delineation of required output constitutes the initial step in design. This is necessary to assure the utility of a model as a vehicle for supplying both explicit and perceived informational needs.

At The Pennsylvania State University, admissions are planned by means of an iterative process, involving the generation of enrollment projections for a series of options concerning the magnitude and composition of admissions with subsequent selection for implementation of the one option which produces an enrollment projection reflecting the greatest consistency with that representing both policy and resource constraints. This projection of enrollment is then employed as the basic input to the procedures employed for developing the University's internal budget and for preparation of documents in support of the appropriation request to the Commonwealth. Although the contents of the projection output required for these three interrelated processes differ from one another, any model from which they are derived must possess a commonality of base to provide assurance of consistency.

For the iterative process involved in planning admissions and enrollments, the enrollment projections must be displayed in a disaggregated form by campus and by degree-level in the initial phase of testing various optional levels of admission. Once the resulting enrollments are in general alignment with policy and resource constraints, further disaggregation by degree-level and in the case of the University Park Campus by college or category of enrollment is usually required.

For application to the internal budgetary process, projections of enrollment are used both as a direct - as well as an indirect - input with the latter involving subsequent use in deriving instructional activity consumption and production from the Instructional Activity Model. As a direct input, the levels of disaggregation required of enrollment projections in the final stage of the admission and enrollment planning process satisfy the requirements of budgetary responsibility, which currently rests at the so-called administrative-division level. However, for analytical purposes, the enroll-

ments are further subdivided by department for the University Park and Capitol Campuses as well as the Hershey Medical Center and by college for the balance of the campuses in the system.

At the present time, in support of the University's appropriation request to the Commonwealth both PPBS and formula submissions are required. Currently enrollment projections on a head-count basis are not required for these submissions. They do, however, represent an indirect input since they are employed in the Instructional Activity Model to derive instructional activity consumption and production values, which are inherent parts of both sets of documents, and to derive projections of degrees-awarded by HEGIS discipline-division in the case of the PPBS process.

For the three interrelated processes, there is consistency in the content required of enrollment projections with respect to campus, degree-level, and student-level. Although somewhat of a dichotomy does exist concerning the level of aggregation required for specifying fields of specialization, the need to delineate these fields at the departmental level for certain campuses of the University and at the HEGIS discipline-division level for the PPBS submission makes it necessary to produce enrollment projections for all campuses at the departmental level of specialization.

CATEGORIZATION OF STUDENTS

In accord with the broad criteria adopted for assessing the utility of enrollment projections in relation to both internal and external needs, students are categorized in accord with attributes identifying physical location, academic level, and field of specialization. Physical location is denoted by campus, academic level by degree-level and within same where appropriate, by student-level, and field of specialization by college or category of enrollment and, within same where appropriate, by departmental responsibility for major programs of study. All measurements of the number

of students within each category are in terms of head-count enrollments applicable to the Fall term of each academic year.

Location

Twenty-five geographical identities are currently employed to classify the locations of attendance for the resident education function of the University. These encompass the twenty-two campuses and centers of the University as well as three other geographical identities which are essentially extensions of programs administered by organizational units at the University Park Campus. For this reason the latter three - involving the nursing program conducted at selected hospitals, graduate students registered for off-campus research, and students enrolled in the study-abroad program - are included for purposes of classifying enrollments as part of University Park Campus. Shown below are the twenty-two locations adopted for use in categorizing students.

TABLE IV-1
CAMPUSES

Allentown Center
 Altoona Campus
 Beaver Campus
 Behrend Campus
 Berks Campus
 Capitol Campus
 Delaware County Campus
 DuBois Campus
 Fayette Campus
 Hazleton Campus
 Hershey Medical Center
 King of Prussia Graduate Center
 McKeesport Campus
 Mont Alto Campus
 New Kensington Campus
 Ogontz Campus
 Schuylkill Campus
 Shenango Valley Campus
 University Park Campus
 Wilkes-Barre Campus
 Worthington-Scranton Campus
 York Campus

Academic Level

Within the hierarchy conceived and used to describe the academic levels of students, students may be categorized from the standpoint of degree-level - associate, baccalaureate, etc. - and within certain of these by student-level - first year, second year, etc. The relationships between these measures of academic level are shown in Table IV-2.

TABLE IV-2
HIERARCHY OF ACADEMIC LEVELS

<u>DEGREE-LEVEL</u>	<u>STUDENT-LEVEL</u>
Associate	1 2
Baccalaureate	1 2 3 4 & 5
Graduate	1 2 or more
Adjunct	Not Applicable

For the application under review, students are classified by degree-level and within same by student-level with one exception. The specific exception concerns suppression of student-level within the graduate degree-level, an expedient necessitated by current data limitations.

Fields of Specialization

Within the hierarchy used to describe fields of specialization, most students may be categorized in accord with the specific major program of study in which they are enrolled, the department having responsibility for the curriculum content of the program, or the college in which the department is situated for organizational and fiscal purposes. For application to the Student Flow Model, student categorization by field of specialization

is limited to the aggregations of majors at the college and departmental organization levels. Although subdivision by major program was conceived as a desirable goal, it was considered to be infeasible to derive reliable projections of enrollment by major at each student-level. It was necessary to impose this limitation because of the very small numbers of students enrolled in most majors - and frequently exhibiting random patterns over time - at many of the campuses of which the University system is composed.

In addition to the eleven colleges offering degree programs at one or more degree-levels, there are four administrative categories in which a student may be classified for purposes of enrollment. These categories of enrollment are Division of Counseling, Capitol Campus, Inter-College, and Non-Degree. For undergraduate study, a student's program is administered by the Division of Counseling if he has not selected a major for study. At the Capitol Campus, the responsibility for undergraduate majors rests with the faculty at that location and the same is true for the preponderance of graduate programs. Students in interdisciplinary programs are classified within the Inter-College category for purposes of enrollment. A student will be assigned non-degree status for purposes of enrollment categorization if he has been admitted to the Graduate School but has not selected a field of study or if he has simply adjunct status. Within each of the eleven colleges as well as the Capitol Campus and Inter-College categories, a further subdivision of major program assignment may be made to departmental units.

Shown in Table IV-3 are the colleges or categories of enrollment and, where applicable within same, the departments adopted for classifying students in accord with their fields of specialization, together with the appropriate five-digit budget code used internally by the University

for resource assignment. In addition is shown for each department the HEGIS discipline-division code applicable to the preponderance of major programs within its area of responsibility.

TABLE IV-3
HIERARCHY OF FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION*

	DEPARTMENT OF ENROLLMENT	HEGIS CODE	
		Bacc.	Assoc.
College of Category of Enrollment College of Agriculture	Name	Budget	
	Agricultural Economics	204-08	01 54
	Agricultural Education	204-10	08 55
	Agricultural Engineering	204-12	09 53
	Entomology	204-13	04 54
	Agromony	204-15	01 54
	Plant Pathology	204-16	04 54
	Animal Science	204-17	01 54
	Dairy Science	204-37	01 54
	Forestry	204-53	01 54
	Horticulture	204-66	01 54
	Poultry Science	204-77	01 54
	Veterinary Science	204-88	04 54
	Inter-Department	204-00	01 54
College of Arts and Architecture	General Education	205-07	10 50
	Architecture	205-11	02 53
	Art History	205-14	10 50
	Landscape Architecture	205-33	02 53
	Music	205-38	10 50
	Art	205-44	10 50
	Theatre	205-48	10 50
	Inter-Department	205-00	10 50
	Accounting	206-11	05 50
	Business Logistics	206-15	05 50
College of Business Administration	Finance	206-19	05 50
	Insurance and Real Estate	206-24	05 50
	Management Science	206-35	05 50
	Marketing	206-36	05 50
	Inter-Department	206-00	05 50

*Status at end of 1971-72 Academic Year.

TABLE IV-3 (continued)
HIERARCHY OF FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

	DEPARTMENT OF ENROLLMENT	Name	Budget	HEGIS CODE			
				Bacc.	Assoc.		
College or Category of Enrollment	College of Earth and Min. Sciences	Geography	224-12	22	55		
		Meteorology	224-18	19	53		
		Geosciences	224-19	19	53		
		Mineral Economics	224-24	19	53		
		Mineral Engineering	224-25	09	53		
		Materials Science and Constitution	224-36&20	09	53		
		Inter-Department	224-00	19	53		
College of Education	College of Education	Academic Curriculum and Field Exp.	212-06&32	08	55		
		Art Education	212-08	08	55		
		Counselor Education	212-09	08	55		
		Educational Psychology	212-10	08	55		
		Educational Policy	212-12	08	55		
		Vocational Education	212-14	08	55		
		Home Economics Education	212-21	08	55		
		Music Education	212-24	08	55		
		Special Education	212-31	08	55		
		Inter-Department	212-00	08	55		
		College of Engineering	College of Engineering	Aerospace Engineering	205-14	09	53
				Architectural Engineering	205-17	09	53
Chemical Engineering	215-19			09	53		
Civil Engineering	215-21			09	53		
Electrical Engineering	215-31			09	53		
Acoustics	215-33			09	53		
Engineering Mechanics	215-37			09	53		
Engineering Science	215-38			09	53		
Industrial Engineering	215-44			09	53		
Mechanical Engineering	215-51			09	53		
General Engineering	215-55			09	53		
Nuclear Engineering	215-56			09	53		
Inter-Department	215-00			09	53		

TABLE IV-3 (continued)
HIERARCHY OF FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

	DEPARTMENT OF ENROLLMENT		HEGIS CODE	
	Name	Budget	Bacc.	Assoc.
College or Category of Enrollment				
College of Health, Physical Education and Recreation				
College of Human Development				
	Instruction	227-11	08	55
	Individual and Family Studies	218-11	13	50
	Biological Health	218-12	12	52
	Biological Health, Nursing	218-13	12	52
	Community Development	218-14	21	55
	Man-Environment Relations	218-15	13	50
	Inter-Department	218-00	21	55
College of Liberal Arts	General Education	221-07	15	50
	Anthropology	221-12	22	55
	Classics	221-15	11	50
	Economics	221-18	22	55
	English	221-20	15	50
	French	221-28	11	50
	German	221-31	11	50
	History	221-34	22	55
	Journalism	221-41	06	50
	Labor Studies	221-43	05	50
	Linguistics	221-46	15	50
	Philosophy	221-51	15	50
	Political Science and Public Administration	221-54	22	55
	Psychology	221-55	20	55
	Religious Studies	221-56	15	50
	Slavic	221-59	11	50
	Sociology	221-64	22	55
	Spanish, Italian, Portuguese	221-65	11	50
	Speech	221-67	15	50
	Inter-Department	221-05	49	50
		221-54	37	

TABLE IV-3 (continued)
HIERARCHY OF FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

	DEPARTMENT OF ENROLLMENT		HEGIS CODE	
	Name	Budget	Bacc.	Assoc.
College or Category of Enrollment				
	College of Medicine			
College of Medicine	Anatomy	217-12	04	54
	Anesthesiology	217-14	12	52
College of Medicine	Comprehensive Medicine	217-15	12	52
	Behavioral Science	217-18	12	52
College of Medicine	Biological Chemistry	217-22	12	52
	Family Medicine	217-25	12	52
College of Medicine	Medicine	217-41	12	52
	Obstetrics	217-47	12	52
College of Medicine	Pathology	217-49	04	54
	Pediatrics	217-51	12	52
College of Medicine	Pharmacology	217-52	12	52
	Psychiatry	217-59	12	52
College of Medicine	Radiology	217-62	12	52
	Surgery	217-67	12	52
College of Science	General Education	228-07	04	54
	Astronomy	228-09	19	53
College of Science	Biochemistry	228-12	04	54
	Biology	228-15	04	54
College of Science	Chemistry	228-21	19	53
	Computer Science	228-28	07	51
College of Science	Mathematics	228-44	07	51
	Microbiology	228-46	04	54
College of Science	Physics	228-54	19	53
	Statistics	228-74	17	53
Division of Counseling				
	Capitol Campus			
Division of Counseling	Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education	260-10	22	55
	Engineering Technology	260-20	09	53
Division of Counseling	Business Administration	260-30	05	50
	Mathematics	260-90	07	51

TABLE IV-3 (continued)
HIERARCHY OF FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

College or Category of Enrollment	DEPARTMENT OF ENROLLMENT		HEGIS CODE	
	Name	Budget	Bacc.	Assoc.
Inter-College	Environmental Pollution Control	231-20	49	50
	Regional Planning and Admin.	231-22	49	50
	Other Graduate Inter-College	232-01	49	50
	Undergraduate Inter-College	231-09	49	50

Non-Degree

DATA REQUIREMENTS

In Chapter II, it was stated, that although the Student Flow Model described in this report was Markovian in concept, it was necessary to rely on other methodology to circumvent current data limitations.

For projecting both associate and baccalaureate degree-level enrollments, which collectively comprise over 80% of the University's resident education enrollment, the flows of students are developed in accord with a Markov-type process, as described conceptually in Chapter III. In this step students were categorized in origin and terminal states in accord with their campus, degree-level, student-level, and college or category of enrollment. Although the basic record, from which the data on student flow were extracted, would have permitted identification of major programs of study, which in turn could have been aggregated to the departmental level, this option was not exercised because of the very small enrollments observed in many of the major programs of study in the various campuses of the University.

In the current absence of machine-addressable longitudinal records on both adjunct and graduate degree-level students, it is not possible to utilize a Markov process as a basis for projecting enrollments of these two classes of students. For adjunct enrollments it is necessary to employ an empirical relationship between the number of adjunct students at a campus and the enrollment of baccalaureate and associate degree-level students. Graduate enrollment projections are developed from linear regression equations by college or category of enrollment at each campus.

Further disaggregation of the enrollment projections for all degree-levels of students by field of specialization from the college to the departmental level is achieved by use of a so-called Organization Matrix, which subdivides the college enrollments on the basis of prior history.

In summation the data requirements may be classified in accord with their application in development of the components of the model as follows:

- 1: Transition matrices for use in the Markov process describing the flow of associate and baccalaureate students.
- 2: An empirically observed relationship between adjunct students and undergraduate enrollments.
- 3: Sets of linear regression equations applicable to graduate enrollments.
- 4: An Organization Matrix for disaggregation of enrollments to the departmental level.

Associate and Baccalaureate Transition Matrices

For projecting both associate and baccalaureate degree-level enrollments, four types of transition matrices are developed for use in "moving" students from each origin state in a Fall term to all possible terminal states in the next Fall term. These are as follows: Campus, Progression, Inter-Campus, and Switch Degree.

The Campus Matrix is the basic vehicle by which students are "moved" from one year to the next within a campus. For each campus at which associate degree-level programs are offered, there are two such matrices, one for each student-level; for campuses offering baccalaureate study there are four, one for each student-level. Each matrix consists of a series of vectors - one for each college of enrollment in an origin state - each of which in turn is comprised of a set of fractions representing the distribution to all terminal states. Within each of these college vectors, the terminal states consist of the colleges of enrollment and additionally the proportions graduating, withdrawing, switching to the other undergraduate degree-level, and transferring to another campus.

In series with each Campus Matrix is a Progression Matrix, by which students are retained at the same student-level or advanced to the next student-level. Each of the vectors, of which the matrix is composed, consists of the two fractions representing the shares advancing and being retained.

Two other types of matrices are used to "move" students among campuses. The first is an Inter-Campus Matrix which, when used in conjunction with the flow of students through the so-called "transfer-cell" in a vector of a Campus Matrix, distributes students of the same degree-level among the campuses. The second is a Switch Degree Matrix which, when used in conjunction with the flow of students through the so-called "switch-degree" cell in a vector of a Campus Matrix, not only distributes students among the campuses but also changes the degree-level of their program of study.

Shown in Figure IV-1 are examples of vectors drawn from the four types of transition matrices and their relationship to one another in the student flow process from an origin to a terminal state.

FIGURE IV-1
INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG TRANSITION MATRIX VECTORS

ORIGIN STATE

Enrollment -
for one campus
for one degree-level
for one student-level
for one college

AGR	.000
A&A	.000
BA	.667
ED	.000
ENG	.024
HPE	.000
HD	.000
LA	.000
EMS	.000
SCI	.021
DOC	.026
IC	.000
GRAD	.000
WD	.167
SD	.024
TRAN	.071

CAMPUS VECTOR

RET	.029
ADV	.071

PROGRESSION VECTOR

AA	.000
AN	.000
BD	.000
BS	.000
BR	.000
CL	.000
DE	.000
DS	.000
FE	.000
HN	.000
MA	.000
MK	.000
NK	.250
OZ	.000
SL	.000
SN	.000
SV	.000
UP	.750
WB	.000
YK	.000


INTER-CAMPUS VECTOR

AA	.000
AN	.000
BD	.167
BS	.000
BR	.083
CL	.000
DE	.000
DS	.167
FE	.333
HN	.000
MA	.083
MK	.000
NK	.000
OZ	.000
SL	.000
SN	.083
SV	.000
UP	.000
WB	.083
YK	.000

SWITCH DEGREE VECTOR

TERMINAL STATE

Enrollment -
by campus
by degree-level
by student-level
by college



These matrices are developed from what is referred to as the Student Master Research Tape - or SMART - which is a series of longitudinal records over time of each undergraduate student indicating his term by term status with respect to degree-level, student-level, major program of study, campus, and attendance status from the time of admission to graduation or alternatively a maximum of twenty elapsed terms. (6) For the purpose of this application, only certain of the fields of each term-record on each student are employed. In Table IV-4 are the appropriate fields within each record on SMART utilized for developing the transition matrices.

For use with the Student Flow Model, the transition matrices are developed annually from data applicable to the changes occurring between the most recent sequential pair of Fall-terms. These values are assumed to be applicable over the entire projected time-frame. The validity of this assumption, however, was subject to evaluation prior to its adoption by generating the matrices for each sequential pair of Fall-terms over the past seven years and examining the patterns of behavior of corresponding values over time. The analysis revealed that the transition probabilities for corresponding categories remained relatively stable when the values were either relatively large in magnitude (i.e. between 0.5 and 1.0 as contrasted to less than 0.1) or were computed from relatively large populations of students. Since both of these conditions contribute to the ability of the model to generate reasonably accurate projections of enrollment, it was concluded that the transition rates were sufficiently stable over time to assume their applicability in the future for purposes of enrollment projection.

Empirical Relationship for Adjunct Enrollment

The projected enrollment of adjunct students is computed by means of an empirical relationship, which on the basis of historical data was found to be applicable at all but four campuses. Basically, the relationship is

TABLE IV-4
FIELDS IN SMART RECORD USED TO CATEGORIZE STUDENTS AT EACH FALL TERM

<u>STUDENT CATEGORY</u>	<u>NAME OF FIELD</u>	<u>CODE IN FIELD</u>
Campus	Campus	2 character Campus Code
Degree-Level	Degree	2 for associate 2 for baccalaureate
Student-Level	Term Standing	1-3 for first year 4-6 for second year 7-9 for third year 10 and over for fourth and fifth year
College or Category of Enrollment	College/Major	3 character Major Code
Switch Degree	Legend	8 for associate to baccalaureate 9 for baccalaureate to associate
Withdrawn	Legend	4, 5, or 6

based on the observation that, as the enrollment of students at the associate and baccalaureate degree-levels at a campus increases, the expression of adjunct enrollment as an equivalent fraction of the associate and baccalaureate enrollment decreases. Utilizing the fractions calculated from historical data and the projected enrollments of associate and baccalaureate degree-level students, adjunct enrollment at a campus is computed using the following relationship:

$$E_{D,ct} = (E_{A,ct} + E_{B,ct}) (f_a)$$

where: $E_{D,ct}$ = adjunct enrollment at campus c in year t

$E_{A,ct}$ = associate enrollment at campus c in year t

$E_{B,ct}$ = baccalaureate enrollment at campus c in year t

f_a = adjunct enrollment as a fraction of associate and baccalaureate enrollment.

The values of f_a for the Altoona and Ogontz Campuses is 0.15 and for the Fayette and New Kensington Campuses is 0.40. For the balance of the campuses in the system, the value of f_a is related to the combined associate and baccalaureate degree-level enrollment at the campus as follows:

<u>Associate and Baccalaureate Enrollment</u>	<u>f_a</u>
< 100	.40
101- 300	.20
301- 500	.10
501- 700	.06
701-1000	.04
1001-2000	.03
>2001	.01

Although the relationship is incorporated within the program logic, it must be reviewed periodically for applicability.

Regression Equations for Graduate Enrollment

Graduate degree-level enrollments are developed from linear regression equations, which are incorporated within the model and are updated annually to reflect new data. The equations represent the graduate degree-level enrollments by college or category of enrollment for each campus of the University over time. The summation of the extrapolated values for any one campus at any point in time is subject to normalization relative to maximum and/or minimum levels of graduate degree-level enrollments permitted at the particular campus. These maximums and minimums are supplied as input to the model.

Organization Matrix

The Organization Matrices are employed to disaggregate enrollments in various fields of specialization from the college to the departmental level. Each matrix consists of a series of vectors - one for each college or category of enrollment at each student-level within degree-level for each campus - each of which in turn is comprised of a set of fractions representing the distribution of a given college's enrollment among the departments of which it is composed. The Organizational Matrices are updated annually from the data issued in the Final Distribution of Enrollment Report for the Fall term.

V: PROJECTION MODEL

In the previous chapters, it was shown

- 1: *that in a multi-campus institution of higher education, the patterns of student movement among academic levels, fields of specialization, and campuses have a significant impact upon the magnitude and major-program composition of the enrollment at any one location,*
- 2: *that these patterns of movement may be described by sets of transition rates expressing the probabilities of students following various paths between successive points in time, and*
- 3: *how a suitable base of historical data may be compiled and used for development of these matrices.*

This chapter is concerned with the use of the components described in the previous chapter as an integrated model, which, given the current enrollment and a forecast of new admissions, may be employed to generate projections of enrollment.

COMPONENTS

The projection model consists of the following major components:

- 1: A series of transition matrices - Campus, Progression, Inter-Campus, and Switch-Degree - consisting of vectors of the fractional distribution of undergraduate enrollment

at one origin state - campus, degree-level, student-level, and college or category of enrollment - in the Fall term of one year among all possible terminal states in the subsequent Fall term.

- 2: A curvilinear relationship between the number of associate and baccalaureate degree-level students at a campus and the equivalent fraction of these students representing adjunct enrollment.
- 3: A series of regression equations representing the enrollment of graduate students over time in each college or category of enrollment at each campus.
- 4: A series of Organizational Matrices - one for each student-level within each degree-level at each campus - consisting of vectors of the fractional distribution of the enrollment in each college or category of enrollment among the departments responsible for the major programs of study.

INPUT

The inputs to the projection model are as follows:

- 1: Actual Fall term enrollment for the most recent historical year subdivided by campus, degree-level, student-level where appropriate, and college or category of enrollment, as developed from the Final Distribution of Enrollment Report issued by the Records Office of the Division of Admissions, Records, and Scheduling.
- 2: Projections of freshmen admissions for each calendar year, but expressed in terms of those registered in the Fall term of the particular year, for as many years as

desired by campus, degree-level, and college or category of enrollment, as generated by the Admissions Model (14).


- 3: Projections of both advanced-standing and adjunct-to-degree undergraduate admissions as well as undergraduate readmissions for each calendar year for as many years as desired by campus, degree-level, student-level, and college or category of enrollment, as generated by the Admissions Model (14).
- 4: Parameters establishing the maximum and minimum levels of graduate enrollment by campus for each year in the projected time-frame.

OPERATION

Procedurally the following steps, as schematically depicted in Figure V-1, are involved in the projection process of the model:

- 1: The actual associate and baccalaureate degree-level enrollment by campus, student-level, and college of enrollment for the most recent Fall term is iterated through the Campus, Progression, Inter-Campus, and Switch-Degree Matrices to derive the enrollment of returning students in the Fall term of the first year in the projected time-frame. To these values are added the forecast of new admissions and of readmissions to generate the projected undergraduate degree-level enrollments for the first year.
- 2: The projected enrollments for the first year in the time-frame are then iterated through the matrices to derive returning students for the second year. To these are added the forecasts of new admissions and readmissions to generate projected undergraduate degree-level enrollments for the second year.

FIGURE V-1
SCHEMATIC DIAGRAM OF STEPS IN ENROLLMENT PROJECTION PROCESS



- 3: The process is then repeated until undergraduate degree-level enrollment projections have been developed for each year in the projected time-frame.
- 4: For each year in the projected time-frame, adjunct enrollments are computed for each campus using the empirical relationship provided within the model.
- 5: For each year in the projected time-frame, graduate enrollments by campus and college or category of enrollment are projected using the regression equations provided within the model and the input parameters relating to the minimum and maximum enrollments by campus.
- 6: The projections of enrollment by college or category of enrollment for each year in the projected time-frame are then disaggregated to the departmental level.

OUTPUT

Output from the projection model is of two types. Common to both is a subdivision of Fall term enrollment for each year in the projected time-frame by degree-level and within same by student-level wherever appropriate.

Detailed Output

The first of the two types is characterized as detailed output of Fall term enrollment and contains for each campus an analysis by college or category of enrollment as well as department wherever appropriate. In order to provide further identification of each departmental entity, the internal five-digit budget and two-digit HEGIS discipline-division codes are also shown. A sample of this output for one campus and one year is shown in Table V-1.

Summary Output

The second type is characterized as summary output. Here the detail by college and department is suppressed to provide on a single page the Fall term enrollment by campus for the entire University system. A sample of this output for one year is shown in Table V-2.

TABLE V-1: DETAIL OF PROJECTED FALL TERM 1975 RESIDENT EDUCATION ENROLLMENT - UNIVERSITY PARK CAMPUS

	ASSC 1	ASSC 2	RACC 1	RACC 2	BACC 3	BACC 4	GRAD	ACJ	TOTAL
AGRICULTURE									
204-08 01*	0	17	102	126	457	403	246		1861
AGRIC ECON	0	17	0	13	23	32	62		147
204-10 01*	0	0	0	37	55	52	24		168
AGRIC ENJG	0	0	0	7	14	12	0		33
204-12 05	0	0	0	0	0	0	24		24
AGRIC ENJG	0	0	0	0	0	0	38		105
204-13 04	0	0	0	24	23	20	31		291
AGRONOMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	38		10
204-15 01	0	0	0	0	105	64	10		350
204-16 04	0	0	0	84	0	0	10		101
PLANT PATH	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		3
204-17 01	0	0	0	0	0	0	10		10
ANIMAL SCI	0	0	0	60	114	117	59		350
204-37 01	0	0	0	24	32	28	17		101
FALPY SCI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
204-53 01*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
FORESTRY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
204-65 01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
HORTIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
204-77 01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
PLTRY SCI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
204-88 04	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
VET SCI	0	0	302	87	91	77	28		585
204-01 01*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
INTER DEPT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
TOTAL:	0	17	102	126	457	403	246		1861
ARTS & ARCH									
205-11 02	0	0	229	267	272	163	249		1387
ARCH	0	0	0	53	50	178	17		298
205-14 1C	0	0	0	8	20	7	82		117
ART HIST	0	0	0	27	47	34	0		110
205-33 02	0	0	0	24	22	11	0		57
LAND ARCH	0	0	0	0	73	80	40		260
205-38 1C	0	0	0	67	67	47	27		205
MUSIC	0	0	0	64	67	47	82		339
205-44 1C	0	0	0	0	0	4	0		0
ART	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
205-48 1C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
THEATRE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
205-00 1C	0	0	229	24	0	0	0		0
INTER DEPT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
TOTAL:	0	0	229	267	272	163	249		1387
BUSINESS ADM									
206-11 05	0	0	268	443	221	221	377		3005
ACCOUNTING	0	0	0	4	297	379	0		679
206-15 05	0	0	0	0	30	74	0		104
BUS LOG	0	0	0	0	40	83	0		123
206-19 05	0	0	0	0	30	64	0		94
FINANCE	0	0	0	0	89	129	0		222
206-24 05	0	0	0	4	69	138	0		211
INS & F	0	0	0	0	436	55	377		1571
206-35 05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
MGT SCI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
206-36 05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
MARKETING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
206-00 05	0	0	268	435	436	55	377		1571
INTER-DEPT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
TOTAL:	0	0	268	443	221	221	377		3005

TABLE V-1 (continued)

EDUCATION									
	ASSC 1	ASSC 2	BACC 1	BACC 2	BACC 3	BACC 4	GRAD	ACJ	TOTAL
INITIAL:	0	0	296	497	1059	922	1020		3794
AC CLERK F F EXP	0	0	0	204	688	645	224		1761
AST FC	0	0	0	40	74	65	61		240
FD DSYC	0	0	0	0	0	0	41		41
FD POLICY	0	0	0	65	138	101	194		498
VFC FD	0	0	0	25	42	28	61		156
MMF FCO FD	0	0	0	0	0	0	41		41
MUSIC FD	0	0	0	25	32	37	31		125
SPER FD	0	0	0	59	74	46	173		392
INTER-DEPT	0	0	296	40	11	0	0		347
CCUN FD	0	0	0	0	0	0	194		194
212-08 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-09 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-10 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-11 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-12 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-13 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-14 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-15 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-16 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-17 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-18 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-19 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-20 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-21 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-22 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-23 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-24 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-25 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-26 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-27 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-28 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-29 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-30 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-31 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-32 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-33 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-34 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-35 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-36 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-37 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-38 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-39 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-40 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-41 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-42 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-43 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-44 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-45 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-46 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-47 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-48 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-49 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-50 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-51 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-52 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-53 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-54 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-55 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-56 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-57 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-58 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-59 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-60 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-61 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-62 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-63 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-64 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-65 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-66 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-67 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-68 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-69 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-70 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-71 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-72 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-73 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-74 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-75 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-76 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-77 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-78 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-79 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-80 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-81 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-82 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-83 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-84 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-85 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-86 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-87 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-88 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-89 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-90 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-91 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-92 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-93 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-94 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-95 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-96 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-97 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-98 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
212-99 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-00 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-01 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-02 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-03 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-04 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-05 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-06 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-07 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-08 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-09 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-10 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-11 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-12 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-13 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-14 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-15 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-16 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-17 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-18 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-19 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-20 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-21 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-22 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-23 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-24 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-25 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-26 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-27 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-28 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-29 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-30 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-31 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-32 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-33 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-34 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-35 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-36 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-37 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-38 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-39 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-40 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-41 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-42 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-43 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-44 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-45 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-46 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-47 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-48 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-49 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-50 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-51 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-52 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-53 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-54 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-55 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-56 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-57 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-58 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-59 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-60 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-61 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-62 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-63 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-64 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-65 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-66 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-67 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-68 CR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
213-69 CR	0	0	0	0</					

TABLE V-1 (continued)

	ASSC 1	ASSC 2	RACC 1	RACC 2	RACC 3	RACC 4	GRAD	ACJ	TOTAL
HUMAN DEV.									
INF & FAM STUD	0	0	310	107	1065	244	170		3192
218-11 13	0	0	0	148	319	244	95		806
218-12 12*	0	0	0	49	75	38	27		189
PIPL HLTH	0	0	0	141	117	85	0		343
218-13 12	0	0	0	193	351	376	0		925
PIPL MIDS	0	0	0	85	202	197	48		532
218-14 21	0	0	0	85	202	197	0		395
COMM DEV	0	0	310	85	0	0	0		
218-15 13*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MAN-ENVIR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
218-00 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
INTER-DEPT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL:	0	0	310	107	1065	244	170		3192
LIBERAL ARS.									
ANTHRO	0	0	1014	292	1706	1400	1056		6175
221-12 22	0	0	0	11	44	34	53		142
221-15 11	0	0	0	0	3	1	11		15
CLASSICS	0	0	0	2	26	34	74		136
ECONOMICS	0	0	0	23	133	146	127		429
221-18 22	0	0	0	0	43	36	53		141
221-24 15	0	0	0	2	17	15	32		66
ENGLISH	0	0	0	9	84	91	74		257
221-28 11	0	0	0	8	171	116	53		365
FRENCH	0	0	0	25	26	25	0		53
GERMAN	0	0	0	2	10	10	21		41
221-31 11	0	0	0	0	32	27	53		118
HISTORY	0	0	0	6	288	217	148		680
221-34 22	0	0	0	27	210	185	116		553
JOURNALISM	0	0	0	42	15	11	23		49
221-41 06	0	0	0	7	5	3	11		23
221-43 05	0	0	0	4	172	144	53		394
LABOR STUD	0	0	0	25	29	17	42		110
221-46 15	0	0	0	22	60	74	95		234
LINGUISTICS	0	0	0	5	138	214	21		2371
221-51 15	0	0	0	784	0	0	0		
PHILSOPHY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
221-54 3722	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
221-55 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
PSYCHOLOGY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
221-56 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
RELIG STUD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
221-59 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SLAVIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SOCIOLOGY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
221-64 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SP LV & NOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
221-66 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
221-67 15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
221-05 49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
INTER-DEPT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL:	0	0	1014	292	1706	1400	1056		6175
EARTH & S.									
GEOGRAPHY	0	0	138	141	196	160	448		1083
224-12 22	0	0	0	3	4	6	54		67
224-18 15	0	0	0	28	41	30	58		157
MEYERBIOLOGY	0	0	0	30	49	37	148		264
224-19 19	0	0	0	6	22	18	36		82
CEROSCIENCES	0	0	0	47	37	40	58		182
224-24 15	0	0	0	18	43	29	94		184
224-25 05	0	0	0	10	0	0	0		148
224-34 2005*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
224-01 19	0	0	138	10	0	0	0		
INTER-DEPT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL:	0	0	138	141	196	160	448		1083

TABLE V-1 (continued)

	ASSC 1	ASSC 2	RACC 1	RACC 2	RACC 3	RACC 4	GRAD	ADJ	TOTAL
SCIENCE	TOTAL:	0	865	751	1188	917	683		4404
GEN ENIG	0	0	865	263	273	220	27		1648
ASTRONOMY	0	0	0	15	12	9	20		56
PHYSICS	0	0	0	45	48	46	68		207
PHYSICS	0	0	0	210	309	266	41		826
PHYSICS	0	0	0	30	71	46	143		290
PHYSICS	0	0	0	90	166	129	123		507
PHYSICS	0	0	0	23	131	64	102		320
PHYSICS	0	0	0	53	154	110	27		344
PHYSICS	0	0	0	23	24	28	102		177
PHYSICS	0	0	0	0	0	0	27		27
D.O.C.	TOTAL:	0	155	267	213	15	0		650
INTER-COLLEGE	TOTAL:	0	0	0	0	0	152		152
FAV BUL CONT	0	0	0	0	0	0	12		12
PL E. AND	0	0	0	0	0	0	32		32
PHY GEN SP EF	0	0	0	0	0	0	88		88
ACUSTICS	0	0	0	0	0	0	20		20
NON-DEGREE	TOTAL:	0	0	0	0	0	479		479
UNIV. PARK	TOTAL:	0	4221	5081	8126	1003	5544		30366

TABLE V-2: SUMMARY OF PROJECTED FALL TERM 1975 RESIDENT EDUCATION ENROLLMENT - THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

	ASSO 1	ASSO 2	BACC 1	BACC 2	BACC 3	BACC 4	GRAD	ADJ	TOTAL
ALLEGANY	263	145	638	429	7	0	0	222	1704
ALLEGANY CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	67	17	12	0	0	38	134
ALLENTOWN	120	65	834	500	52	37	90	48	1746
ALLENTOWN CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BEHREND	188	84	348	147	1	0	0	30	798
BEHREND CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BEAVER	92	50	529	311	6	3	0	39	1037
BEAVER CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	1	1175	908	667	31	2782
CAPITOL	115	49	582	362	10	2	0	33	1153
CAPITOL CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DELAWARE	124	68	191	86	0	0	0	47	518
DELAWARE CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DUBOIS	137	148	326	179	4	3	0	318	1115
DUBOIS CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EAYETTE	55	35	449	197	3	2	0	29	770
EAYETTE CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HAZLETON	180	84	301	142	1	0	0	28	738
HAZLETON CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MCKEESPORT	77	51	667	378	10	4	0	35	1222
MCKEESPORT CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEW KENSINGTON	165	88	353	208	7	1	0	328	1150
NEW KENSINGTON CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OGONTZ	110	61	680	561	8	1	0	213	1634
OGONTZ CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCHUYLKILL	63	36	302	198	1	2	0	36	638
SCHUYLKILL CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCRANTON	128	67	313	203	6	0	0	28	745
SCRANTON CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SHERMANSBURG	78	35	245	116	1	0	0	47	522
SHERMANSBURG CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UNIV. PARK	0	17	4227	5083	8126	7003	5544	366	30366
UNIV. PARK CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WILKES BARRE	89	55	67	20	0	0	0	46	277
WILKES BARRE CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
YORK	91	43	312	144	4	1	0	35	630
YORK CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HERSHEY	0	0	0	0	0	0	434	0	434
HERSHEY CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
KING OF PRUSSIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	255	0	255
KING OF PRUSSIA CAMPUS TOTALS:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PENN. STATE UNIVERSITY GRAND TOTALS:	2082	1181	11435	9282	9434	7967	6990	1997	50368

EVALUATION

Evaluation of the performance of a predictive model usually involves providing actual historical data as input and then comparing the output with the appropriate historical records. By utilizing such an approach any variations between the output from the model and historical data may be attributed to the characteristics of the model itself. However, for evaluation of the model described in this report, a departure from this type of procedure has been adopted which actually provides a somewhat more stringent basis for measurement of validity. Rather than using actual admissions data as input, the output from the Admissions Model (14) was employed. Thus the evaluation is in reality an evaluation of both the Admissions and Student Flow Models on a combined basis. In brief this approach was adopted because of the existence of certain empirical relationships, interfacing between the two models, which essentially translate student admissions throughout a given calendar year into student registrations in the Fall term of the same year with an ensuing question arising as to the proper assignment of these relationships to one of the two models for purposes of evaluation. Adoption of the combined approach eliminates the need for what would otherwise be an arbitrary assignment.

For this reason the evaluation was conducted by comparing the actual 1972 enrollments with those projected by the Student Flow Model, which in turn was provided with input from the Admissions Model containing the targets and parameters which had been established in January 1972 for guidance of the admissions process for that calendar year. From a system-wide standpoint, the total projection of enrollment differed only by 0.5% from the actual.

However, this value is of limited significance for internal management application, since it is achieved in part as a result of compensating errors

in over- and under-projecting the individual sectors of which the University's total enrollment in resident education is composed. Furthermore, since enrollments are ultimately determinants of the demand for instructional services and it is usually infeasible from an operational view to consider the interchange among campuses of resources for the instructional function, the forecast errors of the campus enrollments are of importance. The differences between the projected and actual enrollments for each campus are shown in Table V-3. The summation of these differences, without regard for sign, expressed as a percentage of the actual enrollment for the total system amounts to 4.0%. This means that this fraction of the projected enrollment was distributed among campuses in a manner differing from that which actually occurred.

For evaluation purposes, two other bases may also be of possible interest. In the report on the Instructional Activity Model (13), it was stated that the interchange of resources for providing instructional activity was operationally infeasible not only among the campuses but also, in the case of the University's largest campus at University Park, among colleges. However, errors in the composition of the enrollment at any one location are somewhat mitigated in their impact upon the composition of demand for instructional activity because students register for courses not only within their own college but in others as well. Nevertheless, for evaluation purposes there is interest in the forecast errors among the individual colleges at the University Park Campus and the balance of the campuses as unitary organizations since collectively these units, which internally are categorized as administrative divisions, constitute the level of budgetary responsibility in the University. As shown in Table V-4, the summation of the differences, without regard for sign, between the actual and projected enrollments for these units amounts to 7.9% of the actual enrollment for the total system, which implies that this fraction of the enrollment was distributed by the model among administrative divisions in a manner differing from that which actually transpired.

TABLE V-3
COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND PROJECTED FALL-TERM 1972 ENROLLMENT
BY CAMPUS

	<u>ENROLLMENT</u>		
	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>PROJECTED</u>	<u>DIFFERENCE</u>
	1,700	1,581	-119
	212	145	- 67
	1,573	1,626	+ 53
	714	685	- 29
	936	1,023	+ 87
	2,190	2,495	+305
	1,021	871	-150
	497	471	- 26
	1,062	960	-102
	773	849	+ 76
	749	703	- 46
	1,053	1,041	- 12
	1,026	1,020	- 6
	1,757	1,642	-115
	660	727	+ 67
	649	722	+ 73
	550	499	- 51
	396	293	-103
	564	534	- 30
	301	353	+ 52
	245	341	+ 96
	28,635	28,921	+266
TOTAL	47,263	47,502	+239 (0.5%)
ABSOLUTE SUM	47,263		1,931 (4.0%)

TABLE V-4
COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND PROJECTED FALL-TERM 1972 ENROLLMENT
BY ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

<u>ENROLLMENT</u>			
<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>PROJECTED</u>	<u>DIFFERENCE</u>	
1,700	1,581	-119	
212	145	- 67	
1,573	1,626	+ 53	
714	685	- 29	
936	1,023	+ 87	
2,190	2,495	+305	
1,021	871	-150	
497	471	- 26	
1,062	960	-102	
773	849	+ 76	
749	703	- 46	
1,053	1,041	- 21	
1,026	1,020	- 6	
1,757	1,642	-115	
660	727	+ 67	
649	722	+ 73	
550	499	- 51	
396	293	-103	
564	534	- 30	
301	353	+ 52	
245	341	+ 96	
1,617	1,395	-222	
1,311	1,260	- 51	
2,737	2,710	- 27	
4,255	4,576	+321	
2,781	2,730	- 51	
992	841	-151	
3,045	2,808	-237	
5,698	6,218	+520	
1,013	1,001	- 12	
3,693	3,779	+ 86	
573	672	+ 99	
212	56	-156	
708	875	+167	
TOTAL	47,263	47,502	+239 (0.5%)
ABSOLUTE SUM	47,263		3,765 (7.9%)

The last basis for evaluation purposes concerns the convention which seems to prevail for displaying the enrollment projections resulting from the admissions and enrollment planning process, described briefly in Chapter IV. For this purpose, the projections are subdivided not only by administrative division but also by degree-level. In this case, as shown in Table V-5, the summation of the differences, without regard for sign, between actual and projected enrollments by degree-level for each administrative division amounts to 10.0% of the actual enrollment for the total system, which implies that this fraction of the enrollment was distributed among degree-levels and administrative divisions in a manner differing from that actually occurring.

In closing, it should be noted that the forecast errors, described above, are limited to a one-year projection into the future. At the present time it is obviously not possible to provide an evaluation beyond this time-frame.

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND PROJECTED FALL-TERM 1972 ENROLLMENT
BY DEGREE-LEVEL WITHIN ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

[illegible]

VI: SYSTEM APPLICATION

In the previous chapters, it was shown

- 1: *that in a multi-campus institution of higher education, the patterns of student movement among academic levels, fields of specialization, and campuses have a significant impact upon the magnitude and major-program composition of the enrollment at any one location,*
- 2: *that these patterns of movement may be described by sets of transition rates expressing the probabilities of students following various paths between successive points in time,*
- 3: *how a suitable base of historical data may be compiled and used for development of these transition matrices, and*
- 4: *how these matrices together with ancillary relationships may be used as a projection model, which, given the current enrollment and a forecast of new admissions, may be employed to generate projections of enrollment.*

This chapter is concerned with a description of the system developed to carry out the steps outlined in Chapters IV and V for routine application within The Pennsylvania State University for generation of projections of enrollment for the Fall term. The interrelationships among the components

are delineated and the function, procedural steps, and operational cost of each programmed module are outlined in brief. Details concerning the program logic and application are shown in the Appendices.

COMPONENTS

The system comprising the Student Flow Model consists of three modules. These are programmed in Fortran IV for operation on the IBM System 370/165 in the Computation Center. The first of the modules, COEF-1, is concerned with generation of the various matrices from the Student Master Research Tape. The second, ITER-1, utilizes these matrices as a mechanism for iterating undergraduate students through the system. The third, DISAG-1, generates projections of both graduate and adjunct students and disaggregates both these and undergraduate projections to the departmental level.

The relationship of these modules to one another is shown in Figure VI-1 and a brief description of each is provided below.


COEF-1 Module

The COEF-1 program generates the Campus, Progression, Inter-Campus, and Switch-Degree Matrices from the Student Master Research Tape. Each record on SMART is read and aggregations of enrollment are prepared for the Fall term of each calendar year on the basis of commonality of campus, degree-level, student-level, and college or category of enrollment as well as distributions of the enrollment for each common group among the campus, degree-level, student-level, and college of enrollment for the subsequent Fall term. The distributions to terminal states are then computed as fractions of the total for the corresponding origin states and produced in punched-card form.

ITER-1 Module

The ITER-1 program generates projections of Fall term undergraduate enrollments from the most recent historical enrollment and the projections of admissions for as many years into the future as desired by means of the transitions matrices

FIGURE VI-1
FLOW DIAGRAM OF MODULE INTERRELATIONSHIPS



generated by the COEF-1 module as applicable to the most recent year. The summation of the enrollments of returning students and new admissions is computed for each common group for a Fall term and then multiplied by the appropriate coefficients in the matrices to derive enrollments for the following Fall term. The process is then repeated for as many years into the future as admission projections are provided. The resulting enrollments for associate and baccalaureate students are written for output onto tape.

DISAG-1 Module

The DISAG-1 program reads the undergraduate enrollments from the output of ITER-1, computes the adjunct student enrollment for each campus from the empirical relationship, and by means of regression equations generates enrollment of graduate students. These enrollments, which are produced for each campus, degree-level, student-level, and college or category of enrollment for each Fall term in the projected time-frame, are then disaggregated to the departmental level by means of the Organization Matrix and produced in hard-copy form, as described in the previous chapter.

COST OF OPERATION

The system as described serves two major purposes. The first is concerned with generation of the various transition matrices employed to simulate student movement and the second with the use of these matrices plus additional input for projection application.

Generation of the transition matrices involves the use of the COEF-1 program. This procedure must be carried out only once a year and is characterized as part of the updating process. The overall cost of operation involves an expenditure of \$110 per year.

The projection process involves the input of the matrices from the COEF-1 program, the Organization Matrix computed from the Final Distribution of Enrollment Report, and a forecast of admissions for as many years into the future as

desired as supplied from the Admissions Model. Once the updating for a year has been completed, the projection procedure may be conducted any number of times without the necessity of repeating the steps involved in updating. The cost of each projection run of ten-years duration using ITER-1 and DISAG-1 is \$35.

Shown in Table VI-1 are the operating characteristics involved in application of the three modules as described. It is of note that the data in this table were compiled on the basis of operation on an IBM 360/67. With the installation of a 370/165, CPU time and cost for each module are expected to be lower.

TABLE VI-1
OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS

	<u>CPU Time-Seconds</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Cost</u>
COEF-1 (Baccalaureate)	350	22,000	\$65
COEF-1 (Associate)	130	7,000	45
ITER-1*	100	7,000	14
DISAG-1*	100	21,000	21

* For a run with a projected time-frame of 10 years.

VII: FUTURE EFFORTS

An appraisal of the results of this project and the perceived use of the model have made it desirable that consideration be given to incorporation of certain innovations within the model. Most of these, as will be noted below, are concerned with improvement in predictability.

Projection of Transition Rates

Explicit in the application of the basic Markov process is the assumption that the transition probabilities are stable over time. An analysis of historical data during the development process confirmed the general validity of this assumption for the model in question. However, some exceptions were noted. As an entirely separate project, a multi-method general-forecasting procedure for time-series projection has now been developed. The procedure will be applied on a test basis to historical time-series of transition rates. If significant improvement in predictability is achieved, consideration will be given to incorporation of the procedure within the model.

Inter-Campus Flow

Of major significance in the projection of enrollments of the campuses of The Pennsylvania State University is the impact of student movement among different locations. Currently, inter-campus movement is handled within the model by a two-step process. A single-step process has now been conceived and deemed feasible for implementation. Since application may improve the accuracy of the projections and will permit identification of the flows between campuses, an aspect which is not possible through the existing procedure, early consideration will be given to implementation.

Graduate and Adjunct Enrollment Methodology

As indicated previously, current record limitations preclude the application of the Markov process for determination of both graduate and adjunct enrollments. If and when suitable records become available, the techniques currently used within the model should be replaced by ones conceptually based upon the Markov process. It is of note that the forecast error by degree-level within administrative division of associate and baccalaureate enrollments, which were projected by application of the Markov concept, is only 8% as contrasted to 18% for graduate and adjunct enrollments, which do not use this methodology.

Organization Matrix

The Organization Matrices, which are used for disaggregation of enrollments to the departmental level in regard to field of specialization, must be updated annually. Currently this is done by a manual procedure from hard-copy records, a process which is not only extremely time-consuming but also is inherently prone to inclusion of human error. An alternative source of data must be developed and the procedure programmed for computer operation. To improve the efficiency of the annual updating process, an investigation must be conducted concerning other sources of data for this purpose and the procedure programmed for computer application.

REFERENCES

1. Baisuck, A. and Wallace, W. A., "A Computer Simulation Approach to Enrollment Projection in Higher Education", Rensselaer Research Corporation, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 1970.
2. Firmin, P. A. et al., "University Cost Structure and Behavior", Tulane University, 1967.
3. Gani, J., "Formulae for Projecting Enrollments and Degrees Awarded in Universities", Journal of Royal Statistical Society, Series A, 1963.
4. "Higher Education Enrollment Projections", Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management, State of Washington, 1970.
5. Koenig, H. E. et al., "A Systems Model for Management, Planning, and Resource Allocation in Institutions of Higher Education, Division of Engineering Research, Michigan State University, 1968.
6. Lindsay, C. A. et al., "Development and Utilization of a Student Master Research Tape", Office of Student Affairs, The Pennsylvania State University, 1969.
7. Lovell, C. G. "Student Flow Models: A Review and Conceptualization", N.C.H.E.M.S. at W.I.C.H.E., 1971.
8. Marshall, K. T. et al., "Undergraduate Enrollments and Attendance Patterns", Administrative Studies Project, University of California 1970.
9. Newton, R. D., "Projections of Enrollments and Degrees Awarded", Office of Vice President for Planning, The Pennsylvania State University, 1968.
10. Oliver, R. M., "Models for Predicting Gross Enrollments at The University of California, Ford Foundation Research Program, University of California, 1968.
11. Richard, H. G. "Complex Linear Flow Model of Student Flow", Graduate School and Department of Industrial Engineering, The Pennsylvania State University, 1969.
12. Smith, W. R., "Review of Student Flow Model", University of California at Los Angeles, 1970.

13. Tallman, B. M. and Newton, R. D., "A Model for Projection of Instructional Activity in A Multi-Campus University", Office of Budget and Planning, The Pennsylvania State University, 1973.
14. Tallman, B. M. and Newton, R. D., "A Model for Projection of Undergraduate Admissions in A Multi-Campus University", Office of Budget and Planning, The Pennsylvania State University, 1973.
15. Thonstad, T., "A Mathematical Model of the Norwegian Education System", O.E.C.D., 1967.
16. Zabrowski, E. K., et al., "Student-Teacher Population Growth Model", U. S. Office of Education, 1968.

A: COEF-1 MODULE

The user must supply in addition to the SMART tape the following card input:

- 1: Parameter Card: The following information must be provided in a right justified form in the Column positions noted.

Columns 1- 2: Number of campuses.

Columns 3- 4: Number of years of data to be extracted.

Columns 5- 6: Number of student-levels.

Columns 7- 8: Number of terminal states in campus matrix.

Columns 9-10: Number of colleges or categories of enrollment.

Columns 11-12: Last two digits of last year on SMART.

Columns 13-14: Last two digits of first year of data to be extracted.

Columns 15-16: Degree-level (2 for associate and 4 for baccalaureate).

- 2: Campus Name Cards: One card per campus with abbreviation and name of campus.

Columns 1- 2: Campus abbreviation.

Columns 3-18: Campus name.

- 3: Terminal State Name Cards: One card per terminal state with college code in Column 1 and abbreviation in Columns 2-4 for colleges and with abbreviation only in Columns 2-4 for other states.

<u>Column 1</u>	<u>Columns 2-4</u>
A	AGR
B	AA
E	BA
F	ED
G	ENG
H	HPE
J	HD
L	LA
N	EMS
S	SCI
T	DOC
V	IC
	GRADUATE
	WITHDRAW
	SWITCH-DEGREE
	TRANSFER
	RETAIN
	ADVANCE

The COEF-1 program produces as printed output the Campus, Progression, Inter-Campus, and Switch-Degree Matrices for all years. In addition, punched cards for each Matrix for the most recent year are produced.

(001)

[illegible]

[illegible]

A-5

```

P=.FALSE.
R=.FALSE.
Q=.TRUE.
W=.FALSE.
YZ=XFANW10+2

```

```

110 READ CARDS INTO APPROPRIATIONS

```

```

111 DO 112 J=1,20

```

```

112 READ (5,110) (CARDS(J),J=1,20)

```

```

113 WRITE (6,114) 1,(CARDS(J),J=1,20) (CARD(J),J=1,20)

```

```

114 WRITE (6,114) 1,FILE=1,2,5X,CALCULATED=1,2,5X,CARDS=1,104

```

```

115 DO 116 J=1,20

```

```

116 WRITE (6,116) (CARDS(J),J=1,20)

```

```

117 DO 118 J=1,20

```

```

118 WRITE (6,118) (CARDS(J),J=1,20)

```

```

119 DO 120 J=1,20

```

```

120 WRITE (6,120) (CARDS(J),J=1,20)

```

```

121 DO 121 J=1,20

```

```

122 ICURV=ICURV+1

```

```

123 CALL GET (Y,P,1,250,8,Y)

```

```

124 CONTINUE

```

```

125 DO 125 J=1,20

```

```

126 CONTINUE

```

```

127 DO 127 J=1,20

```

```

128 CONTINUE

```

```

129 DO 129 J=1,20

```

```

130 CONTINUE

```

```

131 DO 131 J=1,20

```

```

132 CONTINUE

```

```

133 DO 133 J=1,20

```

```

134 CONTINUE

```

```

135 DO 135 J=1,20

```

```

136 CONTINUE

```

```

137 DO 137 J=1,20

```

```

138 CONTINUE

```

```

139 DO 139 J=1,20

```

```

140 CONTINUE

```

```

141 DO 141 J=1,20

```

```

142 CONTINUE

```

```

143 DO 143 J=1,20

```

```

144 CONTINUE

```

```

145 DO 145 J=1,20

```

```

146 CONTINUE

```

```

147 DO 147 J=1,20

```

```

148 CONTINUE

```

```

149 DO 149 J=1,20

```

```

150 CONTINUE

```

```

151 DO 151 J=1,20

```

```

152 CONTINUE

```

```

153 DO 153 J=1,20

```

```

154 CONTINUE

```

```

155 DO 155 J=1,20

```

```

156 CONTINUE

```

```

157 DO 157 J=1,20

```

```

158 CONTINUE

```

```

159 DO 159 J=1,20

```

```

160 CONTINUE

```

```

161 DO 161 J=1,20

```

```

162 CONTINUE

```


[illegible]

Line	Code	Statement	Address	Hex
101	C	LOGICAL=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0050	0050
102	C	LOGICAL=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0051	0051
103	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0052	0052
104	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0053	0053
105	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0054	0054
106	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0055	0055
107	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0056	0056
108	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0057	0057
109	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0058	0058
110	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0059	0059
111	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0060	0060
112	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0061	0061
113	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0062	0062
114	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0063	0063
115	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0064	0064
116	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0065	0065
117	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0066	0066
118	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0067	0067
119	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0068	0068
120	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0069	0069
121	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0070	0070
122	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0071	0071
123	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0072	0072
124	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0073	0073
125	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0074	0074
126	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0075	0075
127	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0076	0076
128	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0077	0077
129	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0078	0078
130	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0079	0079
131	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0080	0080
132	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0081	0081
133	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0082	0082
134	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0083	0083
135	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0084	0084
136	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0085	0085
137	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0086	0086
138	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0087	0087
139	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0088	0088
140	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0089	0089
141	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0090	0090
142	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0091	0091
143	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0092	0092
144	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0093	0093
145	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0094	0094
146	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0095	0095
147	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0096	0096
148	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0097	0097
149	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0098	0098
150	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0099	0099
151	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0100	0100
152	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0101	0101
153	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0102	0102
154	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0103	0103
155	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0104	0104
156	C	CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=1, CUMULATIVE=20, 20	0105	0105
157				

```

WRITE (6,100) (COLLPG(I),I=1,5),C(C(I),I=1,2)
100 FORMAT (1,5COLLPGEMAJOR=,5A1,22X,RESIDUE-CLASS=,A1,21X,1G1)
100TY CODE= (,2A1)
WRITE (6,110)
110 FORMAT (1,5,20X,ACHTYPE-RECORD)
WRITE (6,112) (TERM(I),I=1,20)
112 FORMAT (1,1,20X=,2X,201X,1,2X)
WRITE (6,114) (COLLPG(I),I=1,20),C(C(I),I=1,2)
114 FORMAT (1,5COLLPG=,201X,5A1,1X)
WRITE (6,116) (COLLPG(I),I=1,20),C(C(I),I=1,2)
116 FORMAT (1,5,20X=,1X,20(2X,2A1,1X))
WRITE (6,118) (TERM(I),I=1,20)
118 FORMAT (1,5,20X=,1X,20(2X,11,2X))
WRITE (6,120) (TERM(I),I=1,20)
120 FORMAT (1,5,20X=,1X,20(2X,11,2X))
WRITE (6,122)
122 FORMAT (1,5,20X=,1X,20(2X,11,2X))
RETURN
END

```

```

//DATA.FTOSF001 DD UNIT=2400,DSN=(REFCREFS,LCALL=330,RLKSIZ=34001,
// VOL=SESS=11, SW=FKOULL, LABEL=(,10)
// VOL=SESS=12, SW=FKOULL, LABEL=(,10)

```

```

//DATA.FTOSF001 DD *
2007021711/2607

```

```

AAALLIUNDA
AAALLIUNDA

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

```

BUREKED
BUREKED

```

ALL
/ #

THIS IS A SLASH ASTERISK CARD

DATE 10
0130-68

A-14

B: ITER-1 MODULE

The user must supply the following card input for use of the INDEX-1 module:

1: Parameter Card:

- Columns 1- 2: Number of years to be projected.
- Columns 3- 4: Maximum number of student-levels for any one degree-level.
- Columns 5- 6: Maximum number of origin colleges for any one degree-level.
- Columns 7- 8: Maximum number of terminal states in Campus and Progression Matrices for any one degree-level.
- Columns 9-10: Number of campuses.
- Columns 11-12: Row number of "transfer" in Campus and Progression Matrices.
- Columns 13-14: Row number of "switch degree" in Campus and Progression Matrices.
- Columns 15-16: Row number of "retained" in Campus and Progression Matrices.
- Columns 17-18: Row number of "advanced" in Campus and Progression Matrices.
- Columns 19-20: Last two digits of base year.

- 2: Campus Cards: One card per campus with the campus abbreviation in Columns 1-2 and name in Columns 3-20.
- 3: Terminal State Names: One card for each row in the Campus Progression Matrices.
- 4: Coefficient Cards: The Matrices produced as punched output from COEF-1 in the following order.

Campus and Progression: Baccalaureate

Inter-Campus: Baccalaureate
Switch-Degree: Baccalaureate
Inter-Campus: Associate
Switch-Degree: Associate
Campus and Progression: Associate

The last card in the two sets of Campus and Progression Matrices must have a 9 punched in Column 8.

5: Enrollment Cards: Enrollments for the base year must be read in on cards with the following format:

Columns 3-4: Campus number equal to the order in which the campus is processed, which is in alphabetic order of the campus codes.

- 1: Altoona
- 2: Allentown
- 3: Behrend
- 4: Berks
- 5: Beaver
- 6: Capitol
- 7: Delaware
- 8: DuBois
- 9: Fayette
- 10: Hazleton
- 11: Mont Alto
- 12: McKeesport
- 13: New Kensington
- 14: Ogontz
- 15: Schuylkill
- 16: Scranton
- 17: Shenango
- 18: University Park
- 19: Wilkes Barre
- 20: York

Columns 5-6: Student-level of enrollment
1, 2, 3, or 4.

Columns 7-8: College of enrollment number
equal to order in which colleges
are processed.

- 1: Agriculture
- 2: Arts and Architecture
- 3: Business Administration
- 4: Education
- 5: Engineering
- 6: Health and Physical Education
- 7: Human Development
- 8: Liberal Arts

9: Earth and Mineral Sciences
 10: Science
 11: Division of Counseling
 12: Inter-College

Columns 11-15: Baccalaureate enrollment.

Columns 16-17: Associate enrollment.

The last card must have a 9 punched in Column 2. All fields must be right justified.

Example:

Altoona, Freshmen, Agriculture, 41 Baccalaureate,
 14 Associate.

000101010004100014

Example:

Berks, Freshmen, Engineering, 34 Baccalaureate,
 63 Associate.

000401050003400063

The ITER-1 program produces printed output of enrollment by campus, degree-level, student-level, and college of enrollment at the undergraduate level. In addition, a tape output is produced.

-- EXEC PROG

//SOURCE: INPUT.DAT *

IMPLICIT INTEGER (A-Z)

REAL*8 CUMULATIVE

INTEGER*4 JSDW(6)

INTEGER*4 INPUT(20,4,12,2),S(20,4,12,2),S1(1920)

INTEGER C,COS,SIN,XY,X,Y,IO,R,S,P,YAR

INTEGER*2 JSDW(20,4,12),JSDW1(20,2,12)

REAL*4 TEMP(20),ADP(20,4,12,2),REF(20,4,12,2),TRAW(20,4,12,2),

REML(12),LUEP(20,4,12,2),L(4,12),S1(1920),S1(20,2,12,2),

*REF(20,2,12,2),REF1(20,2,12,2),S1(20,2,12,2),ADP(20,2,12,2),

*S1(20,2,12,2),S1(20,2,12,2),LUEP(20,4,12,2),JSDW(20,4,12,2),

*S1(20,4,12,2)

REAL*4 SLOPP(20,4,12),SLOPP1(20,2,12)

LOGICAL*4 S1(1920)

LOGICAL*4 CUMULATIVE(20,20)

POLYNOMIAL (S(1,1,1,1),S(1,1,1,1))

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

PAGE 1

113H-48

B-5

35	ADV(C,L,S,1)=0	1240
	ADV(C,L,S,2)=0	1250
	TRAN(C,L,S,1)=0	1260
	TRAN(C,L,S,2)=0	1270
	SWD(C,L,S,1)=0	1280
	SWD(C,L,S,2)=0	1290
	TAB(C,L,S)=0	1300
	SWCUEF(C,L,S)=0	1310
	TCUEF(C,L,S)=0	1320
	CUEF(C,L,S,1)=0	1330
	DO 30 L=1,2	1340
	TAB(C,L,S)=0	1350
	TICUEF(C,L,S)=0	1360
	SACUEF(C,L,S)=0	1370
	ADV(C,L,S,1)=0	1380
	ADV(C,L,S,2)=0	1390
	RELL(C,L,S,1)=0	1400
	RELL(C,L,S,2)=0	1410
	TRAN(C,L,S,1)=0	1420
	TRAN(C,L,S,2)=0	1430
	SWD(C,L,S,1)=0	1440
	SWD(C,L,S,2)=0	1450
36	ACUEF(C,L,S)=0	1460
37	CUEF(C,L,S)=0	1470
38	*****	1480
39	*****	1490
40	*****	1500
41	*****	1510
42	*****	1520
43	*****	1530
44	*****	1540
45	*****	1550
46	*****	1560
47	*****	1570
48	*****	1580
49	*****	1590
50	*****	1600
51	*****	1610
52	*****	1620
53	*****	1630
54	*****	1640
55	*****	1650
56	*****	1660
57	*****	1670
58	*****	1680
59	*****	1690
60	*****	1700
61	*****	1710
62	*****	1720
63	*****	1730
64	*****	1740
65	*****	1750
66	*****	1760
67	*****	1770
68	*****	1780
69	*****	1790
70	*****	1800
71	*****	1810
72	*****	1820
73	*****	1830
74	*****	1840
75	*****	1850
76	*****	1860
77	*****	1870
78	*****	1880
79	*****	1890
80	*****	1900
81	*****	1910
82	*****	1920
83	*****	1930
84	*****	1940
85	*****	1950
86	*****	1960
87	*****	1970
88	*****	1980
89	*****	1990
90	*****	2000
91	*****	2010
92	*****	2020
93	*****	2030
94	*****	2040
95	*****	2050
96	*****	2060
97	*****	2070
98	*****	2080
99	*****	2090
100	*****	2100

[illegible]

```

130      60 TO 120
131      IF(SWITCHIGH) DO 190
132      DO 140 C=1,CN
133      DO 160 L=1,L2
134      WRITE(6,141)((CAMPUS(J,C),J=1,20),L
135      FURMAT(1,CAMPUS=1,10AL,20X,1ASS, DEGREE COEFFICIENTS=1,10X,1LEVEL=
136      1,12)
137      WRITE(6,8H11CULMAG(S,1),S=1,S5M)
138      DO 145 O=1,O5N
139      WRITE(6,6H11CULMAG(S,1),J=1,21,(ACUEFF(L,L,O),S=1,S5M)
140      - CONTINUE
141      DO 150 L=1,L2
142      WRITE(6,175)OYEAR,L
143      FURMAT(1,SWITCH DEGREE MATRIX ASS, 10 DAC,10X,1TEAMS=1,10X,1A
144      1LEVEL=1,12)
145      WRITE(6,6H11CULMAG(S,1),S=1,S5M)
146      DO 160 C=1,C5N
147      WRITE(6,6H11CAMPUS(J,C),J=1,20),(SACUEFF(L,L,S),S=1,S5M)
148      - CONTINUE
149      DO 170 L=1,L2
150      WRITE(6,175)OYEAR,L
151      FURMAT(1,TEAMS=1,10X,1DEGREE=1,10X,1ASS, 10X,1LEVEL=1,12)
152      1LEVEL=1,12)
153      WRITE(6,6H11CULMAG(S,1),S=1,S5M)
154      DO 180 C=1,C5N
155      WRITE(6,6H11CAMPUS(J,C),J=1,20),(LLEUEFF(L,L,S),S=1,S5M)
156      - CONTINUE
157      DO 190 L=1,L2
158      WRITE(6,175)OYEAR,L
159      FURMAT(1,2X,21D)
160      FURMAT(1,2X,21D)
161      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
162      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
163      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
164      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
165      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
166      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
167      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
168      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
169      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
170      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
171      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
172      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
173      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
174      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
175      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
176      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
177      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
178      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
179      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
180      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
181      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
182      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
183      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
184      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
185      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
186      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
187      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
188      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
189      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
190      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
191      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
192      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
193      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
194      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
195      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
196      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
197      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
198      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
199      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
200      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
201      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
202      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
203      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
204      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
205      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
206      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
207      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
208      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
209      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
210      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
211      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
212      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
213      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
214      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
215      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
216      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
217      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
218      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
219      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
220      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
221      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
222      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
223      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
224      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
225      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
226      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
227      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
228      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
229      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
230      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
231      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
232      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
233      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
234      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
235      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
236      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
237      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
238      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
239      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
240      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
241      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
242      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
243      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
244      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
245      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
246      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
247      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
248      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
249      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
250      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
251      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
252      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
253      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
254      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
255      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
256      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
257      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
258      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
259      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
260      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
261      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
262      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
263      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
264      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
265      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
266      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
267      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
268      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
269      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
270      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
271      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
272      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
273      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
274      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
275      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
276      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
277      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
278      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
279      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
280      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
281      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
282      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
283      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
284      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
285      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
286      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
287      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
288      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
289      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
290      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
291      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
292      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
293      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
294      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
295      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
296      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
297      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
298      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
299      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
300      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
301      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
302      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
303      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
304      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
305      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
306      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
307      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
308      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
309      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
310      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
311      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
312      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
313      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
314      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
315      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
316      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
317      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
318      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
319      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
320      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
321      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
322      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
323      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
324      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
325      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
326      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
327      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
328      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
329      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
330      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
331      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
332      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
333      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
334      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
335      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
336      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
337      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
338      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
339      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
340      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
341      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
342      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
343      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
344      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
345      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
346      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
347      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
348      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
349      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
350      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
351      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
352      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
353      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
354      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
355      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
356      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
357      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
358      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
359      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
360      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
361      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
362      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
363      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
364      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
365      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
366      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
367      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
368      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
369      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
370      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
371      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
372      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
373      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
374      IF(C=1,S=1) 11
375      IF(C=
```

```

130      60 TO 120
131      IF(SWITCHIGH) DO 190
132      DO 140 C=1,CN
133      DO 160 L=1,L2
134      WRITE(6,141)((CAMPUS(J,C),J=1,20),L
135      FURMAT(1,CAMPUS=1,10AL,20X,1ASS, DEGREE COEFFICIENTS=1,10X,1LEVEL=
136      1,12)
137      WRITE(6,8H11CULMAG(S,1),S=1,S5M)
138      DO 145 O=1,O5N
139      WRITE(6,6H11CULMAG(S,1),J=1,21,(ACUEFF(C,L,O),S=1,S5M)
140      - CONTINUE
141      DO 150 L=1,L2
142      WRITE(6,175)OYEAR,L
143      FURMAT(1,SWITCH DEGREE MATRIX ASS, 10 DAC,10X,1TEAMS=1,10X,1
144      1LEVEL=1,12)
145      WRITE(6,6H11CULMAG(S,1),S=1,S5M)
146      DO 160 C=1,C5N
147      WRITE(6,6H11CAMPUS(J,C),J=1,20),(SACUEFF(C,L,S),S=1,S5M)
148      - CONTINUE
149      DO 170 L=1,L2
150      WRITE(6,175)OYEAR,L
151      FURMAT(1,TEAMS=1,10X,1DEGREE=1,10X,1
152      1LEVEL=1,12)
153      WRITE(6,6H11CULMAG(S,1),S=1,S5M)
154      DO 180 C=1,C5N
155      WRITE(6,6H11CAMPUS(J,C),J=1,20),(LLEUEFF(C,L,S),S=1,S5M)
156      - CONTINUE
157      DO 190 L=1,L2
158      WRITE(6,175)OYEAR,L
159      FURMAT(1,2X,21J)
160      FURMAT(1,2X,21J)
161      IF(C=1,S=1,L=1)
162      DO 200 S=1,S5N
163      DO 250 L=1,L5
164      TRILLST=0
165      SDAL(S)=0
166      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
167      TRILLST=0
168      TRILLST=0
169      SDAL(S)=0
170      CONTINUE
171      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
172      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
173      DO 210 I=1,1920
174      NSH(I)=0
175      DO 220 S=1,S5N
176      DO 250 L=1,L5
177      TRILLST=0
178      SDAL(S)=0
179      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
180      TRILLST=0
181      SDAL(S)=0
182      CONTINUE
183      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
184      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
185      DO 210 I=1,1920
186      NSH(I)=0
187      DO 220 S=1,S5N
188      DO 250 L=1,L5
189      TRILLST=0
190      SDAL(S)=0
191      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
192      TRILLST=0
193      SDAL(S)=0
194      CONTINUE
195      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
196      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
197      DO 210 I=1,1920
198      NSH(I)=0
199      DO 220 S=1,S5N
200      DO 250 L=1,L5
201      TRILLST=0
202      SDAL(S)=0
203      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
204      TRILLST=0
205      SDAL(S)=0
206      CONTINUE
207      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
208      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
209      DO 210 I=1,1920
210      NSH(I)=0
211      DO 220 S=1,S5N
212      DO 250 L=1,L5
213      TRILLST=0
214      SDAL(S)=0
215      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
216      TRILLST=0
217      SDAL(S)=0
218      CONTINUE
219      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
220      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
221      DO 210 I=1,1920
222      NSH(I)=0
223      DO 220 S=1,S5N
224      DO 250 L=1,L5
225      TRILLST=0
226      SDAL(S)=0
227      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
228      TRILLST=0
229      SDAL(S)=0
230      CONTINUE
231      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
232      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
233      DO 210 I=1,1920
234      NSH(I)=0
235      DO 220 S=1,S5N
236      DO 250 L=1,L5
237      TRILLST=0
238      SDAL(S)=0
239      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
240      TRILLST=0
241      SDAL(S)=0
242      CONTINUE
243      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
244      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
245      DO 210 I=1,1920
246      NSH(I)=0
247      DO 220 S=1,S5N
248      DO 250 L=1,L5
249      TRILLST=0
250      SDAL(S)=0
251      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
252      TRILLST=0
253      SDAL(S)=0
254      CONTINUE
255      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
256      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
257      DO 210 I=1,1920
258      NSH(I)=0
259      DO 220 S=1,S5N
260      DO 250 L=1,L5
261      TRILLST=0
262      SDAL(S)=0
263      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
264      TRILLST=0
265      SDAL(S)=0
266      CONTINUE
267      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
268      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
269      DO 210 I=1,1920
270      NSH(I)=0
271      DO 220 S=1,S5N
272      DO 250 L=1,L5
273      TRILLST=0
274      SDAL(S)=0
275      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
276      TRILLST=0
277      SDAL(S)=0
278      CONTINUE
279      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
280      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
281      DO 210 I=1,1920
282      NSH(I)=0
283      DO 220 S=1,S5N
284      DO 250 L=1,L5
285      TRILLST=0
286      SDAL(S)=0
287      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
288      TRILLST=0
289      SDAL(S)=0
290      CONTINUE
291      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
292      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
293      DO 210 I=1,1920
294      NSH(I)=0
295      DO 220 S=1,S5N
296      DO 250 L=1,L5
297      TRILLST=0
298      SDAL(S)=0
299      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
300      TRILLST=0
301      SDAL(S)=0
302      CONTINUE
303      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
304      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
305      DO 210 I=1,1920
306      NSH(I)=0
307      DO 220 S=1,S5N
308      DO 250 L=1,L5
309      TRILLST=0
310      SDAL(S)=0
311      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
312      TRILLST=0
313      SDAL(S)=0
314      CONTINUE
315      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
316      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
317      DO 210 I=1,1920
318      NSH(I)=0
319      DO 220 S=1,S5N
320      DO 250 L=1,L5
321      TRILLST=0
322      SDAL(S)=0
323      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
324      TRILLST=0
325      SDAL(S)=0
326      CONTINUE
327      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
328      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
329      DO 210 I=1,1920
330      NSH(I)=0
331      DO 220 S=1,S5N
332      DO 250 L=1,L5
333      TRILLST=0
334      SDAL(S)=0
335      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
336      TRILLST=0
337      SDAL(S)=0
338      CONTINUE
339      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
340      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
341      DO 210 I=1,1920
342      NSH(I)=0
343      DO 220 S=1,S5N
344      DO 250 L=1,L5
345      TRILLST=0
346      SDAL(S)=0
347      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
348      TRILLST=0
349      SDAL(S)=0
350      CONTINUE
351      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
352      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
353      DO 210 I=1,1920
354      NSH(I)=0
355      DO 220 S=1,S5N
356      DO 250 L=1,L5
357      TRILLST=0
358      SDAL(S)=0
359      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
360      TRILLST=0
361      SDAL(S)=0
362      CONTINUE
363      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
364      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
365      DO 210 I=1,1920
366      NSH(I)=0
367      DO 220 S=1,S5N
368      DO 250 L=1,L5
369      TRILLST=0
370      SDAL(S)=0
371      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
372      TRILLST=0
373      SDAL(S)=0
374      CONTINUE
375      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
376      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
377      DO 210 I=1,1920
378      NSH(I)=0
379      DO 220 S=1,S5N
380      DO 250 L=1,L5
381      TRILLST=0
382      SDAL(S)=0
383      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
384      TRILLST=0
385      SDAL(S)=0
386      CONTINUE
387      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
388      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
389      DO 210 I=1,1920
390      NSH(I)=0
391      DO 220 S=1,S5N
392      DO 250 L=1,L5
393      TRILLST=0
394      SDAL(S)=0
395      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
396      TRILLST=0
397      SDAL(S)=0
398      CONTINUE
399      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
400      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
401      DO 210 I=1,1920
402      NSH(I)=0
403      DO 220 S=1,S5N
404      DO 250 L=1,L5
405      TRILLST=0
406      SDAL(S)=0
407      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
408      TRILLST=0
409      SDAL(S)=0
410      CONTINUE
411      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
412      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
413      DO 210 I=1,1920
414      NSH(I)=0
415      DO 220 S=1,S5N
416      DO 250 L=1,L5
417      TRILLST=0
418      SDAL(S)=0
419      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
420      TRILLST=0
421      SDAL(S)=0
422      CONTINUE
423      IF(Y=20,2)J=3=10
424      INITIALIZE VARIABLES
425      DO 210 I=1,1920
426      NSH(I)=0
427      DO 220 S=1,S5N
428      DO 250 L=1,L5
429      TRILLST=0
430      SDAL(S)=0
431      IF(L=1,2)GO TO 250
432      TRILLST=0
433      SDAL(S)=0
434      CONTINUE
435
```


4800

4850

```

/*      THIS IS A SLASH ASTERISK CARD
//DATA.FILOF001 DD UNIT=(2400,DEFER),VOL=SER=BMI15,DSN=BMI15,
//  DISP=(NEW,KEEP),DCB=(RECFM=FB,LRECL=80,BLKSIZE=3200)
//DATA.FILOF001 DD UNIT=(2400,DEFER),VOL=SER=BMI19,DSN=BMI19,
//  DISP=(OLD,KEEP),DCB=(RECFM=FB,LRECL=20,BLKSIZE=3200)
//DATA.INPUT DD *
    
```

C: DISAG-1 MODULE

In addition to the tape output from ITER-1, the user must provide the following card input:

- 1: Campus Cards: One card per campus. The first twenty campuses are in campus abbreviation order as specified for ITER-1. King of Prussia and Hershey are 21 and 22 respectively.

Columns 1- 2: Campus code.

Columns 3-18: Campus name.

- 2: College Cards: One card per college or category of enrollment. The number of departments within each college is right justified in Columns 1-2. The college name follows beginning in Column 3 with the order of colleges as shown below.

Agriculture
Arts and Architecture
Business Administration
Education
Engineering
Health and Physical Education
Human Development
Liberal Arts
Earth and Mineral Sciences
Science
Inter-College
Capitol
Medicine
Non-Degree

- 3: Department Cards: The department names and associated budget and HEGIS discipline-division code of the first college, followed by the names of the second etc. One card per department is left justified.

Columns 3-18: Department name.

Columns 19-26: Budget-code.

Columns 27-34: HEGIS code.

- 4: Organization Matrix Cards: One card per department showing the fraction of each college's enrollment, degree-level, and student-level at a campus represented by the department.

Columns 1- 2: Campus number, right justified.

Columns 11-12: College code.

Columns 14-15: Department number, right justified.

Columns 21-25: Fraction of first year associate with decimal point at 22.

Columns 26-30: Fraction of second year associate with decimal point at 27.

Columns 31-35: Fraction of first year baccalaureate with decimal point at 32.

Columns 36-40: Fraction of second year baccalaureate with decimal point at 37.

Columns 41-45: Fraction of third year baccalaureate with decimal point at 42.

Columns 46-50: Fraction of fourth year baccalaureate with decimal point at 47.

Columns 51-55: Graduate with decimal point at 52.

20X,7F5.0

- 5: Campus Graduate Regression Equations: These project the number of graduate students at each campus and are prepared using library program POLY-2. One card per campus.
- 6: College Graduate Regression Equations: One card per college at each campus having graduate enrollment with the campus number in Columns 1-2 and the college number in Columns 3-4, where the number represents the order in which the campus and college cards are entered.

7: Year Card: One card for each year of enrollment.

Columns 1- 5: Planned level of graduate enrollment right justified.

Columns 6-10: Number of campuses with graduate enrollment constraints right justified.

Column 15: Index for type of output desired.

1 = output by campus

2 = output by campus and college

3 = output by campus, college, and department

8: Graduate Constraint Cards: The number of cards will be the number specified in Columns 6-10 of the Year Card.

Columns 1- 5: Campus number right justified.

Columns 6-10: Minimum constraint.

Columns 11-15: Maximum constraint. (Note maximum constraint must be denoted as 99999).

In addition to the printed output of enrollment by year, campus, degree-level, student-level, college, and department, a tape output is generated for use into CONSUM-1 of the IA-1 model.

150 FORM 1 (212,68,210.0)

IF (CEN.0) GO TO 152

HC(C.S)=XX

MC(C.S)=YY

GO TO 148

152 CONTINUE

Comment: Start of Iteration phase.

DO 234 Y=1,400

DD 154 Y=1,400

154 INITIAL=0

DIFF=0.0

ITER=1

IV=1970+Y

YEAR=1970

WRITE (9,100) IV

155 FURCAL VALUE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, 1955, SURVEIL PLUS FURCAL VALUE

1EL 0.190, CAMPUS TOTALS, 100,14,77,000

WRITE (18,212)

IF (V.C.S) GO TO 152

Comment: Graduate Enrollment Phase.

IF (S.C.S) WRITE (9,100) IV

156 FURCAL VALUE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY FURCAL VALUE

1905 FOR 1.14

Comment: Totalize Campus Construction Every Year.

DO 160 L=1,20

160 MAX(L)=0

Comment: Read Planned Level for Each Level and Other Campuses

162 FURCAL VALUE

IF (L.C.S) GO TO 153

Comment: Read Year Level

READ (5,102) LEVEL,ICOM,UNITPUL

162 FURCAL VALUE

IF (L.C.S) GO TO 153

Comment: Read Campus Construction for Year 1970

DO 164 J=1,100

164 FURCAL VALUE

MIN(L)=1

165 MAX(L)=0

166 MAX(L)=0

